





BV 811.5 .K455
Kerr, James, 1805-1855.
A treatise on the mode of
baptism

A

TREATISE
ON THE
MODE OF BAPTISM,

SHOWING THE UNFOUNDED NATURE OF THE AS-
SUMPTION, THAT IMMERSION IS THE ONLY
PROPER MODE OF ADMINISTERING
THE ORDINANCE;

AND

THAT POURING OR SPRINKLING, IS THE MOST
SCRIPTURAL AND SIGNIFICANT, AND BY
FAR THE PREFERABLE MODE OF
ITS ADMINISTRATION.

BY REV. JAMES KERR,
Pastor of the Presbyterian Church of Cadiz, Ohio.

STEUBENVILLE:
PUBLISHED BY ABNER L. FRAZER.
MDCCCLXIV.

Entered according to Act of Congress in the year 1844,
BY REV. JAMES KERR,
In the Clerk's Office of the District Court of Ohio.

Printed by L. HARPER, Cadiz.

CONTENTS.

DISCOURSE I.

Introductory remarks—The signification of the words *Bapto* and *Baptidzo*—No obligations to adhere rigidly to immersion, even if immerse be the signification of the word *Baptidzo*—Immerse not the signification of the word *Baptidzo* as used in the scripturés—This shown from Luke 11: 38, Mark 7: 4, Heb. 9: 10—Immersion none of the modes of symbolical cleansing under the Old Testament dispensation—The signification of the words used in connection with *Baptidzo* considered, *En*, *Eis*, *Apo*, *Ek*.

DISCOURSE II.

The different places and circumstances in which baptism was administered, considered—The baptism of John the Baptist; 1st, Improbability that he immersed; 2d, Improbability; 3d, Improbability—Baptism of the Eunuch considered—Baptism of Lydia—Baptism of the three thousand on the day of Pentecost; 1st, Improbability that they were immersed; 2d, Improbability; 3d, Improbability—Recent mode of getting over the difficulty arising from the want of water at that season of the year, for the immersion of so great a multitude, in so short a time—Baptism of Saul—Baptism of Cornelius and his friends—Baptism of the jailor and his family.

DISCOURSE III.

Figurative language and allusions to baptism in the Holy Scriptures. 1 Cor. 10: 2, “Baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea.” 1 Peter 3: 20, 21, “The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us,” &c. Rom. 6: 3, 5, Buried with him by baptism into death,” &c. John 3: 5. “Except a man be born of wa-

ter and of the Spirit," &c. Rom. 6: 17, " Ye have obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine which was delivered you"—Arguments of a different kind in favor of immersion considered; 1st, Argument; 2d, Argument; 3d, Argument.

DISCOURSE IV.

I. Pouring or sprinkling the most scriptural and significant mode of administering the ordinance of baptism—The use of water in this ordinance, symbolical of the cleansing influences of the Holy Spirit—The Holy Spirit represented in scripture as being poured out, shed forth, or falling upon men—Sprinkling a prominent mode of symbolical cleansing under the law—Foretold to be a prominent mode of symbolical cleansing under the gospel—Symbolizes the manner of the Spirit's descending upon man—Symbolizes the manner in which the blood of Christ is represented as being applied to the soul—The baptism of the Holy Ghost not symbolized by immersion—No sense in which we can be said to be immersed in the Holy Ghost.

II. Pouring or sprinkling by far the preferable mode of administering the ordinance—It is suited to all times and places—May be administered thus under any circumstances without endangering life or health—May be administered thus with much more solemnity than by immersion—Affords the persons to be baptized a much better opportunity of being properly exercised in their own minds—Conclusion.

P R E F A C E.

The substance of the following pages was originally delivered in the Presbyterian Church of Cadiz, Ohio; having been occasioned by vigorous efforts, previously made, to unsettle the opinions of Christians on the subject of which they treat. And as the author has been induced to believe, that the presentation of the subject to the congregation was productive of salutary effect, he has consented, at the request of many for whose opinion he has a high regard, to present it to the public. The work might have been considered more complete had it contained one or two discourses on the *subjects* of Baptism, but as this would have swelled the book to a considerably larger size, and thus enhanced its price; and as the *mode* of baptism is the great proselyting engine of our opponents, it was thought best to present it in its present form. That it may have a tendency to establish christians in the faith, prevent them from being driven about with every wind of doctrine, and fortify them against the inroads of those who would substitute a mere external rite for the spirituality of the gospel, is the prayer of the

AUTHOR.



MODE OF BAPTISM.

DISCOURSE I.

Math. 28: 19, "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."

Men have in all ages been exceedingly prone to attach an undue importance to external religious ceremonies; and the carnal and natural mind has always been offended at the simplicity of the gospel, and the spirituality of its worship.

The heathen have, in all ages, and in every part of the world, considered the observance of external rites, the principal part, if not the whole, of their religion; and the more expensive and imposing those rites are, and the more difficult they are of observance, the greater importance do they attach to them, and the greater merit do they consider their observers as possessing.

The Pharisees attached an undue importance to external ceremonies. They pretended to be possessed of a greater amount of holiness, and were more scrupulously exact in the observance

of many parts of the Jewish ritual, than others; but it was all for outward show; that by their attention to the externals of religion, they might gain the respect and applause of men. They made broad their phylacteries, and enlarged the borders of their garments—they prayed at the corners of the streets, and for a pretence made *long* prayers—they paid tithes of mint, and anise, and cummin—they made clean the outside of the cup and platter—and they builded the tombs of the prophets, and garnished the sepulchres of the righteous; while the accusation of Christ himself is recorded against them, that they did all these things to be seen of men; and the wo of God denounced against them for the neglect of judgment, mercy, and faith.

In the days of the apostles too, the churches of Christ were distracted, by the teachings of those who were bent on imposing upon christians, the observance of the whole Jewish ritual; and who took the high ground, that those observances were absolutely necessary to salvation; “Except ye be circumcised after the manner of Moses ye cannot be saved.”*

And for many centuries, the (so called) Roman Catholic church, has been burdened with

*Acts 15, 1; see also, verse 5 and 24.

a host of imposing and expensive ceremonies, wholly unwarranted by the word of God; and to the observance of which, far more importance is attached, than to union to the Lord Jesus Christ by faith, or to internal communion with the Father of spirits and with his son Jesus Christ.

It is but the carrying out of the same principle, and the manifestation of the same disposition, that we now find in the immense importance that is attached by some, to the mode in which the sacrament of baptism is administered. It is but the same disposition, directed in somewhat of a different channel to be sure, and restrained in some measure by the influence of the gospel; but, it is but the same disposition, that leads the Hindoos to attach so much importance to their pilgrimages, and bathings, and swingings; which led the Pharisees to make broad their phylacteries, and bestow alms, and make long prayers; and which induces the adherents of popery to submit to all the imposing and expensive ceremonies of that delusion. It is the same disposition that is manifested in all—a disposition to attach an undue importance to the externals of religion.

The religion of the Lord Jesus Christ is em-

phatically a spiritual religion. It is the religion of the heart—of the soul. A religion which brings its possessor into mysterious and close relationship to the Creator, and intimate communion with the Father of Spirits. And it is a religion which has a constant tendency to draw off the affections and desires of the soul from worldly objects, and fix them more and more on heavenly things, until they become all, as it were, swallowed up in the contemplation and enjoyment of its God. And while it has so many external ceremonies connected with it, as are calculated, through the medium of sense, to assist our faith; and as are adapted to prevent us from prosecuting a meditative or contemplative religion so far as to degenerate into superstitious enthusiasm; yet it every where represents even these ceremonies as of little importance, in comparison with the religion of the heart.

In both the sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, the only two ordinances of our holy religion, in which sensible signs are used to represent spiritual things, and to assist the faith of the believer in the contemplation of spiritual objects; it is the state of mind and disposition of heart with which they are recei-

ved, that is the principal thing of importance in either ordinance. The sacrament of Baptism or the Lord's supper either, might be administered by the Lord Jesus Christ himself, or by his expressly commissioned and inspired ambassadors, according to the most exact pattern which its auther has prescribed, without the smallest benefit accruing to the individual receiving it. Such was doubtless the case with Judas who received the supper at the hands of our Lord, and of Simon Magus who was baptized by Philip the evangelist. It is not the mere external observance of either ordinance, that will be either acceptable in the sight of God, or profitable to the individual receiving it, but the internal state and disposition of the heart with which it is received.

If this idea were properly embraced and realized, it would go far to convince men, that the vast importance which they attach to, and the controversies which they excite in the christian church about, the mere *modus operandi* of either ordinance, are aside from the essence of true religion; and show them, that, in their zeal for the mode of administration, they are in danger of losing sight of that which constitutes the thing itself, and all that is really important in

it—that they are in danger of grasping at the shadow to the loss of the substance.

While all branches of the christian church hold to the propriety and obligation of the ordinance of baptism, in obedience to the command of Christ, and for the purposes for which it was instituted; there has been considerable difference, at different times, in different branches of the christian church, in the mode of its administration. By some it has been administered by pouring, by others it has been administered by sprinkling, and by others again by dipping or plunging. The mere mode of administering this ordinance we consider a matter of comparatively trifling importance; and were it not for the vast importance that is attached to it by some, and the danger in which they are of putting the mode of administering this ordinance in the place of Christ himself as their chief dependence; we should never think of making it a subject of controversy. Were it not for the exclusive claim which they set up, to the possession of the only legitimate and valid mode of administration, and the unchristian spirit with which they denounce and unchurch all who practise a different mode from themselves, we should never think of controverting the point,

or of disturbing them in the peaceful practice of the mode of their preference. We might, if the subject came in course, endeavour to show that ours was not only a valid mode of administration, but the preferable mode, the mode most expressive of the thing signified by it, and most conformable to the practice of the apostles; but we should never think of entering into a labour-ed discussion of the subject, any more than we do of throwing down the gauntlet to those who differ from us, in the mode of administering or receiving the supper.

There are some who administer the sacrament of the supper to communicants in a kneeling, instead of a sitting position. Well, we have no quarrel with them on that subject; and while they are contented peaceably to pursue their method, we are contented peaceably to pursue ours; and though if the subject came before us in course, we would not hesitate to present our views on it, and endeavour to show that ours was the most proper and suitable mode, and most conformable to the original institution; yet we should never think of starting a controversy on the subject, nor of disturbing the peace of the christian church, by agitating so comparatively unimportant a point; for we verily believe that

christians may be acceptable and profitable communicants in either mode of reception.

If however those who practise kneeling at the Lord's table, were to take the ground, that kneeling is the only proper and scriptural mode of receiving that ordinance; and that they who do not receive it in that posture do not commune at all, but are guilty of neglecting that sacred ordinance, and of disregarding the command of Christ "Do this in remembrance of me;" and by their continual agitation of the subject, were in danger of disturbing the faith of God's people; you can easily perceive, that, the mere posture in which the sacrament of the supper is received, though in itself a matter of little importance, would assume a *vast* importance, in consequence of the position taken by one of the parties; and would lay us under the necessity of vindicating our own practice, and exposing the unfounded nature of the claims which they set up.

In the same manner; were Baptists peaceably to pursue their own course, and practise their own mode of administering the ordinance, we should have no quarrel with them. Were they to direct their energies to the conversion and salvation of sinners, without constantly agi-

tating this point as if it were one on which salvation depended, they should meet with no opposition from us; for we should infinitely more rejoice over the conversion and salvation of sinners, by whose instrumentality soever achieved, than over victory on any so comparatively unimportant a matter. But when we find men making baptism almost the beginning, middle, and end, of their religion; when we find them directing sinners more frequently to the river, than to the cross; when we find them in danger of putting the mode of administering this ordinance in the place of the Saviour, to the ruin of their souls; when we find them assuming that immersion is the only proper and valid mode of administering this ordinance; when we find them constantly affirming that all who have not been baptized in this manner, have not been baptized at all, but are unbaptized persons, living in neglect of this sacred ordinance, and not included within the pale of the church of Christ. I say, when we find all this going on around us, the mode of administering this ordinance is presented in a very different aspect; and that which would otherwise be of little importance, assumes an importance of no common interest. It becomes therefore our duty, to expose the unsoun-

ded assumption of those who would unchurch the great majority of the christian world, and vindicate our own practice, from the calumnies and slanders which have been raised against it.

The text presents before us the institution of this ordinance, and the authority for its observance. - "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." In speaking on this subject then it shall be our object,

IN THE FIRST PLACE, TO SHOW THE FALACY AND
ERRONEOUSNESS OF THE ASSUMPTION, THAT IM-
MERSION IS THE ONLY PROPER AND VALID MODE
OF ADMINISTERING THIS ORDINANCE; AND

IN THE SECOND PLACE, THAT POURING OR SPRINK-
LING IS NOT ONLY A VALID MODE, BUT THE MOST
SIGNIFICANT, MOST SCRIPTURAL, AND BY FAR THE
PREFERABLE MODE OF ITS ADMINISTRATION.

In the first place, we shall endeavour to show the falacy and erroneousness of the assumption, that immersion is the only proper and valid mode of the administration of this ordinance. In doing this it will be necessary to examine the various arguments by which this assumption is sustained, and if they are found to be inconclusive or wide of the point, our object will be accomplished.

The first and principal argument of our Baptist friends, is the meaning of the words *Bapto* and *Baptidzo*. The greatest stress is constantly laid by our opponents, upon the meaning of the Greek word *Baptidzo*, and *Bapto* from which it is derived. It is assumed that they invariably mean to immerse, and hence that the very word used to express the ordinance, is indicative of the manner in which it should be administered.

If such were the proper and only meaning of the word *bapto*, this would not sustain their position; for the word *bapto* is never used in scripture in reference to this ordinance. It is only the root whence the word used to express the ordinance is derived; and every one acquainted with the derivation of words knows, that while there is some similarity, there is almost always a considerable difference, between the meaning of the root and its derivatives. Take an example or two in English. Kingdom is derived from the word king; and while there is enough of similarity in the word kingdom, to the word king, to indicate its parentage, there is also enough of dissimilarity, to prevent any one from supposing that both words mean the same thing. Penmanship is derived from the word pen; yet who would think of maintaining, that a pen and the

art of writing, meant the same thing? So that if to immerse were the only meaning of the word *bapto*, it would not prove that such is the meaning of the word *baptidzo* which is derived from it.

The original and radical meaning of the word *bapto*, if we can believe the great body of learned critics and lexicographers, is *to tinge, to stain, to wet*; and that by whatever means this is accomplished; whether by sprinkling, or pouring, or dipping, or plunging; and hence when used in the sense of sprinkling, or pouring, or dipping, it is only by way of accommodation, and not as its radical signification.* It is used by the Greek authors to express the staining or colouring of the waters of a lake by the blood of a frog; and it is used also to express the loss of a fleet, when overwhelmed and sunk in the sea. The assumption that we so frequently hear maintained, that it always has the idea of immersion in it, is wholly without foundation. What kind of idea of immersion is included in that expression of Homer, *ebapteto de aimati limne*, ‘the lake was baptized with blood;’ when that blood was

*A late eminent anti-pœdobaptist writer while he strenuously maintains that *Baptidzo* always signifies to immerse, acknowledges that he has “all the lexicographers and commentators against him in this opinion.” (Carson on Baptism p. 79). See Miller on Baptism p. 66.

the blood of a frog? This word is but seldom used in the New Testament, but we shall turn you to one or two instances in which it is used, and in which it is evident that it cannot possibly mean immersion. Math. 26; 23. "And he answered and said, he that dippeth his hand with me in the dish, the same shall betray me."—The word here rendered dippeth, is *embapsas*, baptizeth, but certainly we cannot imagine that there was any thing like immersion here. If in dipping their piece into the gravy (for they used no knives and forks in those days,) they wet the tips of their fingers this is the utmost that can be supposed. But that they immersed their whole hand in it, is ridiculous nonsense. We are aware of the manner in which our Baptist friends endeavour to avoid the force of this passage. It is by supposing that in reaching the hand into the dish they might have to reach so far down, that the hand would be under the outer edge or lip of the vessel, and thus might be said to be immersed in it. But what would this be but immersing the hand in an empty dish; and certainly Baptists would not consider it good baptism, for a person to be laid down in an empty pool, merely because he was lower than the outside edge of the pool, where the water fre-

quently reaches. But who does not know that by the word dish here is meant, not the metal or other material of which the dish was composed, but that which the dish contained; as when Christ says "This cup is the New Testament in my blood; this do ye as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me,"* he did not mean the material of which the cup was composed, but the fruit of the vine which it contained. In the expression "He that dippeth his hand with me in the dish," the word *bapto* is used when there is not the smallest idea of immersion included.— Rev. 19; 13. "And he was clothed with a vesture dipped in blood; and his name is called The Word of God." *Bebammenon aimati*, baptized with blood. The whole connexion of this verse shows that Christ is here represented under the figure of a conqueror. But he is a conqueror whose garments are stained with blood, showing the fierceness of the contest in which he was engaged, and affording evidence of the destruction of the enemies by whom he was opposed. Now though we may find many warriors whose garments have been sprinkled or stained with blood, either their own, or that which has spouted from the wounds of their enemies, I believe history

*I. Cor. 11; 25.

has yet to record the first instance, of a conqueror after the victory had been gained, immersing his garments in the blood of the slain. Hence that is not the idea here contained, and the word would have been better rendered according to its original meaning, *stained* with blood. That this is the meaning of the word in this place is manifest from a comparison of this passage with the parallel passage in the prophecy of Isaiah. Here it is said in immediate connexion with the verse already quoted, "And the armies which were in heaven followed him upon white horses, clothed in fine linen white and clean. And out of his mouth goeth a sharp sword, that with it he should smite the nations: and he shall rule them with a rod of iron; and he treadeth the winepress of the fierceness and wrath of Almighty God." Compare this with Is. 63; 3. "I have trodden the wine press alone; and of the people there was none with me: for I will tread them in mine anger, and trample them in my fury; *and their blood shall be sprinkled upon my garments, and I will stain all my raiment.*"

In these two instances then it is evident, that the word *bapto* is used without any thing like the idea of immersion included. But as we already

remarked, this word is not used to express this ordinance. We may therefore leave it, and turn our attention to *Baptidzo*, the word by which the ordinance is invariably expressed.

Of this word also it is maintained by our opponents, that it always, and only means immersion; and that no baptism performed in any other way than by immersion, comes up to the meaning of the word, or is baptism at all. This too, they are by their system, under the necessity of maintaining; for the moment they yield that *Baptidzo* means any thing else than immersion, that moment they give up the whole point at issue, and are in danger of losing their denominational distinction.

I. Now here we are willing to take higher ground than perhaps most of you would suspect, and maintain, that even if they are correct in their interpretation of this word, (which we think we shall be able to convince you in the sequel is not the case) that even if their interpretation of the word be correct, and it means immersion, and immersion only, yet we are under no imperative obligation to adhere rigidly to that mode of administering this ordinance.

The sacrament of the Lord's supper is certainly as important an ordinance as the sacra-

ment of baptism. It was instituted in as solemn a manner, under as solemn circumstances, and for as important purposes. And a rigid adherence to the words of that institution, and to the mode in which it was originally observed, is certainly as obligatory upon every christian, as a rigid adherence to the mode in which baptism was at first administered. Well, the ministers of a large and respectable denomination of christians, in administering the sacrament of the Lord's supper, instead of using the words of Christ, in handing the elements to the people, "Take, eat; this is my body, which is broken for you: this do in remembrance of me," use the following: "The body of our Lord Jesus Christ which was given for *thee*, preserve *thy soul* and *body* unto everlasting life. Take and eat this in remembrance that Christ died for *thee*, and feed on him in *thy heart* by faith with thanksgiving."* Now though we do not at all approve of this substitution of other words for the words of Christ in the administration of this sacrament, we would by no means represent it as a mockery, or say that those who make use of these words do not commemorate the dying love of the Redeemer at all: nor do we know

*Methodist Discipline, page 100.

that our opponents have ever so expressed themselves on this subject. Why then that open denunciation and unchurching of all who do not adhere rigidly to every iota, in the administration of baptism?

Again, we do not know that there is a denomination of Christians on the face of the earth, who receive the sacrament of the supper in the position or attitude in which it was originally received. It was received in the attitude or position in which people dined or supped in those days, and that was a reclining position. Let any individual lie down flat on his left side, and then raise himself up a little so as to lean on his left elbow, and be at liberty to use his right hand, and he will have just the position, in which the sacrament of the supper was received by the disciples, at the hand of our Lord. If then the whole christian world, and our Baptist brethren among the rest, have considered themselves at liberty to depart so far in this particular from the mode in which the sacrament of the supper was at first received, and that merely because the former mode of sitting at table has gone out of fashion, or because it would be very inconvenient for a large assembly; with what face, and on what authority can they maintain, that we ought to

adhere rigidly to the very mode in which the sacrament of baptism was at first administered?

Further, where is the denomination of christians, who act up to the full meaning of the word by which the sacrament of the supper is denominated? Who ever makes a full supper at the Lord's table? But if we are under imperative obligations, to come up to the full meaning, of the word immersion, if that be the meaning in the sacrament of baptism, as significant of a spiritual cleansing from sin; we are just under as strong obligations, to come up to the full meaning of the word in the other instance, and eat a hearty supper, as significant of feeding on the Lord Jesus Christ by faith. The one is a positive institution as well as the other, and ought as rigidly to be adhered to in all particulars.

Further still. The apostles certainly knew what was essential to the proper administration of the ordinance of baptism, and their example when fully ascertained, has all the force of a direct command. Now look at the words of the institution as recorded in the text. "Baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost." The name in which the individual is to be baptized, is certainly a very important part of the ceremony, and without

the proper and solemn pronouncing of which, even our opponents, we suppose, would not consider the ordinance duly administered. Indeed we should certainly conclude, that if there were any part of the service that could not possibly be dispensed with, it would be the solemn pronouncing of the name of the triune God. We think all must admit, that following the very letter, in reference to this part of the service, is at least as imperative, as following it in reference to the meaning of the word *baptidzo*. And yet there is no instance on record, in scripture, in which baptism was administered as here commanded. No instance in which it was administered in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. If there was nothing said about the name in which baptism was administered, then we would of course conclude that it had been administered according to the words of the institution. But we are told in whose name it was administered, and that was not literally the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. It was in the name of the Lord, or in the name of the Lord Jesus, or in the name of Jesus Christ.*

How then can we account for the apostles

*Acts 2; 38. 8; 16. 10; 48.

deviating so far from the words of the institution? Only by the fact that the Lord Jesus being God as well as man, in him dwelling all the fulness of the Godhead bodily, the words of the institution were thus essentially, if not literally complied with. Baptizing in the name of the Lord Jesus, was essentially, and to all intents and purposes, the same, as baptizing in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. And if any of our ministers were now to administer the ordinance simply in the name of the Lord Jesus, though we might reprove him for it, because that as a church we have agreed to follow the original words of the institution, and he in connecting himself with us, has voluntarily consented to this arrangement, and hence might be deserving of reproof for violating his own engagements; yet we would never think of considering baptism thus administered, invalid, or of administering it over again. Baptism was thus administered by the apostles, and hence it was all that was considered essential to the proper performance of the ordinance. If then the inspired apostles of our Lord, could deviate so materially from the words of the institution, and yet retain all that was necessary to its proper administration; do not those assume

an unwarrantable authority, who affirm, that a strict and rigid adherence to the very letter, is necessary to its validity. Indeed it would seem as if the Spirit of inspiration had directed them thus to act, for the very purpose of refuting those, who, in future years, should attach a superstitious importance to modes and ceremonies.

II. While therefore we hold, that, even if to immerse were the proper meaning of the word *baptidzo*, we would be under no imperative obligation to adhere rigidly to that mode of administering the ordinance; from the fact, that the whole christian world, our opponents among the rest, deviate in important particulars from the manner in which the sacrament of the supper was at first administered, without ever being considered as neglecting or abusing the ordinance, though that is equally a positive institution, and equally important with baptism; and from the fact that the apostles themselves deviated from the strict letter of this institution, in a more important point than the mode of applying the water. We proceed a step further, and maintain, that, to immerse, is not the only proper meaning of the word *baptidzo*, nor as it is used in the scriptures, is it the meaning of the word at all. That to immerse, so far from being

the meaning of the word, is not *a* meaning of the word, as it is used in the scriptures.

We request your patient attention, and your company in following us, while we endeavour to make good this position. We do not wish to put you off with mere declamation, or the mere expression of our own opinion on the subject. We wish to lead you to an investigation of the Holy Scriptures, and if our position is not sustained by them let it fall to the ground.

It is not denied, that the word *baptidzo* is sometimes used in the sense of immersion by the Greek authors, but every one acquainted with those authors knows, that it is also used by them in the sense of pouring or sprinkling.— This might be abundantly shown by examples from their writings, but this is not the place to enter into such a criticism, nor would it be important to the subject. What we wish to ascertain now, is, the signification of the word, as it is used in the book of God; and this can only be ascertained from an examination of the book itself, and a diligent comparison of one part with another. If we wish to ascertain the true sense in which any particular term is used by any writer, we must examine, and compare together, the different places and connexions in which it

is used by that writer. It will not always do to interpret the terms used by one author, by the sense in which they are used by another. For example; you may take up one author, and you will find it stated that Christ is a Divine person; and from a comparison of the different places in which that expression is used in the work, you will easily perceive, that he understands by it, that Christ is God, equal with the Father. You may take up another author, and you will find the same expression, that Christ is a Divine person. Well, will it do interpret the expression in this author, by the sense in which it was used by the other? By no means; for by examining this author's writings more carefully, you will find that he is not a believer in the supreme Divinity of the Lord Jesus Christ at all; and consequently when he uses the word Divine in connexion with Christ, it is much in the same sense that we are accustomed to use it in connexion with men, as when we say of such a one, "He is an eminent and pious divine." You may take up a profane history and read an account of a battle, and among other things you will find it mentioned that there were so many pieces of *ordinance* on the field. What are we to understand by the word ordinance here? manifestly

cannon or great guns. Take up an ecclesiastical history, and you will read of the *ordinance* of baptism, and if you interpret the word in this history, by the sense in which it was used in the other, it will mean, the great guns of baptism!

The principle thing, is to ascertain in what sense the word is used in the Holy Scriptures, and this can only be ascertained from an examination of the scriptures themselves. Let us then examine into the meaning of the word, in those places where this ordinance is not referred to; and this will enable us to understand its meaning, where it is used in connexion with this ordinance.

Luke 11; 38. "And when the Pharisee saw it, he marvelled that he had not first washed before dinner." The word here rendered washed is *ebaptisthee*, the same that is rendered in other places baptized: and hence the literal reading of the passage according to the manner in which this word is so frequently translated, would be, "The Pharisee marvelled that he had not first baptized before dinner." Can the word as used in this place be supposed to mean immersion? Did the Pharisee expect the Lord Jesus Christ to immerse before dinner? or were the Pharisees themselves in the habit of immersing before

meals? Yet our opponents are obliged to maintain this absurdity, or give up the point, that *baptidzo* always means to immerse and nothing else. The scriptures however do not leave us ignorant of the sense in which *baptidzo* is here used, for we find the same thing referred to in another place, where a different word is employed. Math. 15; 2. "Why do thy disciples transgress the tradition of the elders? for they **WASH** not their hands when they eat bread." Mark 7; 2, 3. "And when they saw some of his disciples eat bread with defiled (that is to say, with **UNWASHEN**) hands, they found fault. For the Pharisees and all the Jews, except they **WASH** their hands oft, eat not, holding the tradition of the elders." In both of these quotations, it is the word *Nipto** that is used, a word which properly and invariably signifies to wash or cleanse. But it is evident that it is the same practice of cleansing before meals that is referred to in both instances. Luke tells us that the Pharisee marvelled that Christ had not first (*baptidzo*) bap-

*We shall frequently in the course of this discussion make use of the first person singular indicative of the verb, instead of the particular part in which the verb occurs (unless when a direct quotation is made), as being more easily followed and understood by the unlearned reader.

tized before dinner, and Mathew tells us that the Pharisees challenged the disciples because they did not (*nipto*) wash before dinner. Why did the Pharisees marvel that Christ had not first *baptidzo* before dinner, but just because, as Mark tells us, it was their own custom to (*nipto*) wash before meals? "For except they wash (*nipto*) their hands they eat not." It is manifest then that the word *nipto* to wash, and *baptidzo* to baptize, are used interchangeably the one for the other, and the use of the word *nipto*, (a word whose signification is uncontroverted) in the same manner, and in reference to the same subject, as *baptidzo*, clearly determines the sense in which the latter word is employed.— Here then is one instance in which *baptidzo* cannot mean immerse; for it is interpreted in another part of scripture to mean wash.

It may be objected that they would have to put their hands into the water for the purpose of washing them. Well, that is a mere circumstance. They might have done so or they might not. Washing of hands was frequently performed by pouring as well as by dipping, 2 Kings 3; 11. "And one of the king of Israel's servants answered and said, Here is Elisha the son of Shaphat, which poured water on the hands

of Elijah." And who does not know that washing by having water poured on the hands is a very common practise in many parts of our own country. But as already remarked, this is a mere circumstance, and does not enter into the idea conveyed by the word at all. The word signifies to wash or cleanse, the thing done, and not the manner in which it was performed.

Mark 7; 4. "And when they come from the market, except they wash, they eat not. And many other things there be, which they have received to hold, as the washing of cups, and pots, brazen vessels, and of tables." The word here rendered washing is *baptismous*, baptisms; the baptisms of cups, and pots, of brazen vessels, and of tables.' Now, if it be so that cups and pots were immersed in water, for the purpose of washing, is it at all probable that tables were washed in this manner? The word rendered tables also means couches, on which they reclined at table, and is it at all probable that *they* were immersed in water for the purpose of washing? Here then we have baptisms or washings performed in different ways, both by putting the object to be washed into the water, and by putting the water on the object to be washed. But as we have already remarked, the mode of wash-

ing is a mere circumstance, it may be gathered from other circumstances or it may not; but is not contained in the word *baptismos*. This expresses washing, the thing done, and not the manner of its performance.

Compare the 3d and 4th verses a little more closely. "For the Pharisees and all the Jews, except they **WASH** their hands oft, eat not, holding the tradition of the elders. And when they come from the market, except they **WASH** they eat not." The very same meaning must be attached to the word wash in each of these verses.— "Except they **WASH** their hand oft they eat not;" and, "And when they come from the market, except they **WASH** they eat not." The same thing is as evidently intended by these two sentences as can be. The one is just a repetition of the sentiment contained in the other. But in the former sentence the word for wash is *nipto*, and in the latter it is *baptidzo*; and hence here is as plain an instance as could possibly be put on paper, of the two words being used interchangeably the one for the other: and as *nipto* means invariably to wash or cleanse, we have in it, the scriptural definition of the word *baptidzo*, with which it is interchangeably used.

The word used in the latter clause of the fifth

verse, will also assist us in determining the meaning of *baptidzo*; “Why walk not thy disciples according to the tradition of the elders, but eat bread with *unwashen* hands?” The word render unwashen here is *koinos*, unclean or defiled hands. Not that the disciples were filthy in eating, but the Pharisees were so very particular and ceremonious, that they must always, before eating, go through the process of cleansing, whether there was any necessity for it or not; which both Christ and his disciples often omitted. The Pharisees found fault with the disciples because they did not wash (*baptidzo*) before dinner, as they did who held the tradition of the elders; and here the fault is repeated, and said to be that they ate with unclean or defiled hands. What they required of the disciples then, was, to wash or cleanse their hands before eating, and this also determines the meaning of the word *baptidzo* as used in this connexion. It is neither to immerse, nor to pour, nor sprinkle, but to wash or cleanse, the thing done, and not the manner of its performance.

Heb. 9; 10. “Which stood only in meats and drinks, and divers washings, and carnal ordinances, imposed on them until the time of reformation.” Divers washing, *diaphorois baptis-*

mois, divers baptisms. This expression refers to the ancient Jewish economy, in which washings, or as it is here called baptisms, constituted a great part of their round of ceremonies.— Well, the apostle says that those baptisms were of different kinds, *diaphorois*, a word which as every Greek scholar knows, points out things of a different kind. If then immersion was practised by the Jews, it is plain, that that was not the only mode of baptism practised by them, for the apostle says *diaphorois baptismois*, diverse baptisms; and the assumption of our opponents that *baptismois*, baptism, means immersion only, is a flat contradiction of the language of the apostle, who tells us, that there were different kinds of baptisms. But the apostle refers to one of those different kinds of baptisms in the following verses. And which of those different kinds of baptisms does he single out as an example of his meaning? Is it immersion? No; not a word about it. Is it sprinkling? Yes; it is just that much abused and ridiculed mode of symbolical cleansing, sprinkling. Verse 13, “For if the blood of bulls and of goats and the ashes of an heifer SPRINKLING the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh,” &c. Here the apostle singles out an instance or example of those di-

vers baptisms of which he had spoken, and it is the sprinkling of the blood of bulls and of goats and the ashes of a heifer, for the purifying of the flesh. But he goes on; and does he take another example now? No; he sticks to the same example which he had already introduced. Verse 19, "For when Moses had spoken every precept to all the people according to the law, he took the blood of calves and of goats, with water, and scarlet wool, and hyssop, and SPRINKLED both the book and all the people—Moreover he SPRINKLED likewise with blood both the tabernacle and all the vessels of the ministry."

It is evident then, that sprinkling is a proper mode of baptism; for it is the very mode which the apostle singles out as an example of the *diaphorois baptismois*, or different kinds of baptisms, of which he had spoken. As we have already remarked, the apostle in the expression divers baptisms, refers to the different cleansing ceremonies of the former dispensation. And if it can be shown that immersion was one of these, there can be no difficulty in showing that sprinkling was another; for the apostle has furnished us with examples to our hand. And hence it must be admitted that a symbolical cleansing by sprinkling, is as properly called baptism, as a

symbolical cleansing by immersion, for it is one of the *diaphorois baptismois* of the apostle.

Bvt we go a step further, and maintain it as our firm belief, after the most dilligent search we have been able to institute, that immersion was none of the modes of symbolical cleansing under that dispensation; and hence, is none of the *diaphorois baptismois* of which the apostle speaks. We find washing, and pouring, and sprinkling, often and again, practised under that dispensation, as a means of symbolical cleansing, but no where do we find immersion used at all. And we fear not to hazzard the expression, that there is no evident case on record, either in the Old or New Testament, of one individual having been immersed by another, as a religious ordinance.

There are a few instances in which it might possibly seem to some as if immersion had been practised under the former dispensation, and at these we shall look for a moment. Lev. 15; 5. "And whosoever toucheth his bed shall wash his clothes, and *bathe* himself in water, and be unclean until the even. And he that sitteth on any thing whereon he sat that hath the issue, shall wash his clothes, and *bathe* himself in water, and be unclean until the even. And if he that

hath the issue spit upon him that is clean; then he shall wash his clothes, and *bathe* himself in water, and be unclean until the even," &c.—The same form of expression may be found in Lev. 16; 26, 28. and Num. 19; 7, 8, &c. The word rendered bathe in these instances, and in all the other cases in which it is found in connexion with the Levitical ceremonies, is not a word that signifies to dip or immerse. It is *Rauhatts*, a word which properly signifies to wash or cleanse; and a word which is in numerous other instances so rendered. Lev. 14; 8. "And he that is to be cleansed shall wash his clothes, and shave off all his hair, and wash (*Rauhatts*) himself in water. 9. But it shall be on the seventh day, that he shall shave all his hair off his head, and his beard, and his eyebrows, even all his hair he shall shave off; and he shall wash his clothes, also he shall wash (*Rauhatts*) his flesh in water and he shall be clean." The word rendered wash in both these instances is the same that was in the other case translated bathe.—Ex. 30; 18, 19, 20, 21. "Thou shalt also make a laver of brass, and his foot also of brass, to *wash* withal; and thou shalt put it between the tabernacle of the congregation and the altar, and thou shalt put water therein; for Aaron and

his sons shall *wash* their hands and their feet thereat. When they go into the tabernacle of the congregation, they shall *wash* with water, that they die not; or when they come near to the altar to minister, to burn offering made by fire unto the Lord; So they shall *wash* their hands and their feet, that they die not." See also, Ex. 40; 30, 31, 32. In all these instances the word rendered wash is *Rauhatt*, the same that was in the other case rendered bathe. When Abraham invited the three men that stood by him, to *wash* their feet and rest themselves under the tree. When Lot invited the angels that came to Sodom at even, to tarry all night, and *wash* their feet; and when it is said of Joseph, that after having wept he *washed* his face and went out and refrained himself; it is in all these instances the same word *Rauhatt*, that is used.*

There is a word which properly signifies to dip or immerse, used in a few instances in connexion with these ceremonies, and we shall refer you to a specimen of the manner in which it is used. Lev. 4; 6. "And the priest shall *dip* his finger in the blood, and sprinkle of the blood seven times before the Lord." Verse 17. "And the priest shall *dip* his finger in some of the blood,

*See Gen. 18; 4. 19: 2. 43; 24, 31.

and sprinkle it seven times before the Lord, even before the vail." Lev. 14; 6. "As for the living bird, he shall take it, and the cedar-wood, and the scarlet, and the hyssop, and shall *dip* them and the living bird in the blood of the bird that was killed over the running water; And he shall sprinkle upon him that is to be cleansed from the leprosy seven times." Here the word rendered dip, is *Taubal*, a word which properly signifies to dip or immerse, but it is used only in reference to the finger or other instrument to be employed in sprinkling. And, by the way, this kind of immersion is practised every time that an infant is baptized. The administrator must dip (*taabal*) his hand in water, for the purpose of sprinkling the object that is to be symbolically cleansed.

We say then that immersion is none of the divers baptisms of which the apostle speaks, for it was not practised as a mode of symbolical cleansing under the former dispensation. But washing, and pouring, and sprinkling, are the divers baptisms to which he refers, because they were frequently practised. Look at the cleansing of the leper, for instance, in the fourteenth chapter of Leviticus, and you will find all the three modes there called into operation. He

was to be *sprinkled* with the blood of the bird that had been killed over running water. He was to *wash* his clothes, and shave off all his hair, and *wash* his flesh in water; and he was to have that oil that was in the priest's hand, *poured* upon his head. Here all the three modes were practised and in reference to each it is said 'and he shall be clean.' Had immersion been employed as one of the modes of ceremonial cleansing under the former dispensation, then our opponents might claim to stand on an equal footing with ourselves, but not one step higher; but they cannot even claim this, for there is no mention of it at all.

We think then from what has been said, it will appear plain, that *baptidzo*, with its kindred terms, as used in the scriptures, does not mean immersion, but washing or cleansing. It is used for the washing or cleansing of the hands before meals. It is used for the washing or cleansing of cups, and pots, and brazen vessels, and tables. It is used interchangeably with *nipto*, a word which invariably signifies to wash or cleanse.—It is used as the opposite of *koinos*, impure or defiled, and has reference to the removing of that defilement by washing or cleansing; and it is used for those ceremonial cleansings that were

practised among the Jews, washing, and pouring, and sprinkling; but none of which consisted in immersion.

Here we cannot help remarking, that the more we examine the word of God, the more we are struck with the scriptural accuracy and correctness, of the definitions contained in that most excellent summary of doctrine, "The Shorter Catechism." We had proceeded almost thus far, in our investigation of this subject, before it occurred to us, that this is just the definition given of baptism in that summary. "Baptism is the washing with water, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." It is a washing (of course a symbolical washing) or cleansing with water; without any reference at all, to the manner in which that washing or cleansing is performed.

One other remark before we leave this part of the subject. It has been said, that, if *baptidzo* does mean to wash or cleanse with out reference to the mode of its performance, that if we could ascertain the manner in which John baptized, then as Christ instituted the ordinance of baptism without giving any special directions about it, we might justly infer, that his baptism would be administered in the same manner as John's—

that with which the disciples were acquainted. This is plausible. But the same mode of reasoning ought to carry us farther back, and aid us in ascertaining what the mode of John's baptism was. Baptism was practised among the Jews long before the days of John, for the apostle says that their system stood in *diaphorois baptismois*, different kinds of baptisms. Now we think it would be reasonable to conclude that John's baptism would be some of those kinds with which he and all the people of the Jews were well acquainted. But our Baptist brethren suppose that John practised, and they practise after him, just the very mode, which had not been practised among the Jews at all, and for which John could have had no precedent.

III. Another argument on which our opponents depend for sustaining their cause, is derived from the words that are frequently used in connexion with *baptidzo*. These are *en* and *eis*, sometimes translated *in* and *into*; and *ek* and *apo*, translated *out of*. Hence, because our translation reads in one or two instances that they went into the water, and came out of the water, it is inferred that they must have been immersed. Now every Greek scholar knows well, that each of these particles has a great variety of signifi-

cations, and which particular signification it has in any given case, is only to be determined by the connexion in which it is found, and the nature of the subject to which it is applied,* Consequently nothing on this subject can be determined from them; because in no instance do they occur in connexion with the word *baptidzo*, but another signification than in, and out of, will equally well suit both the connexion and the subject.

We know that our Baptist brethren are in the habit of ridiculing this mode of argumentation; but it is much easier to exhibit a sally of wit, than it is to answer a logical argument, or to turn aside the force of truth. What we have said is a truth, and every one who makes any pretensions to a knowledge of the original languages of scripture, knows it to be a truth; and all the

*For example; one of our standard Lexicographers, Schrevelius, who interprets in the Latin language, gives the signification of *eis*, “ad, in erga, contra, super, post, propter, apud, per, inter, de, pro,” that is to, in, towards, against, above, after, hard by, at, by, between, of for. The same Lexicographer interprets *apo*, as follows; “a ab, post, ante, præ, propter, per, ex, de, absque,” that is, from, after, before, hard by or for, by out, of, of, without. It will be perceived that these two words have in many cases the same signification, and hence the folly of constructing an argument upon the meaning of such indefinite terms.

ridicule that may be heaped upon it, or all the evil consequences that a fruitful imagination may conjure up as likely to flow from it, will not alter the fact. There it stands, and there it will stand, whether men believe that "Daniel was ever *in* the Lion's den, or Shadrach, Meshach and Abednego ever *in* the fiery furnace" or not.

We do not say as they would sometimes represent us as saying, that *in*, does not mean *in*, and *out of*, does not mean *out of*; but we do say, and they cannot gainsay it, that the Greek particle *en*, has not always the signification of the English word *in*; nor the Greek word *apo*, always, nor even commonly, the signification of the English words, *out of*.

I have examined upwards of sixty places in the New Testament, in which the Greek word *en*, is and must necessarily be, translated differently from *in*, and upwards of thirty in which *eis* is translated differently from *into*; and nearly as many instances in which *ek* and *apo* are translated differently from *out of*. We must be contented with specifying but a few instances of each of these words in this place.

In Mark 1; 5. we read; "And there went out unto him all the land of Judea, and they of Jerusalem, and were all baptized of him in the river

of Jordan, confessing their sins." This is a clear evidence, say our Baptist friends, that all those persons were immersed. But how does the fact that they were in the river, prove that they were immersed in it? Have we not all seen persons in a river a hundred times, without any immersion going on? And even if we admit the correctness of the translation here, it will require something altogether different from this, to show that there was any immersion in the case.

But the word translated in, here, has also the significations of at, near, by, through, for, towards, nigh to, &c., and as we remarked before, which of these significations it has in any particular place, is only to be gathered from the nature of the subject, and the connexion in which it is found. Hence it cannot be proved that in, is the signification of the word in this instance; because several other significations of the word, will equally well suit both the subject and the place; and, *at* the river, or *by* the river, or *near* the river, would be all equally good translations with, *in* the river, and equally well suited both to the subject and the connexion.

But say our opponents; "We are satisfied with the translation we have—we are willing to take

the bible just as it reads." Well let us see how long they will stick to this resolution. Just till they get down to the eighth verse of this same chapter, and no longer, where John says, "I indeed have baptized you *with* water; but he shall baptize you *with* the Holy Ghost." Baptizing *with* water and baptizing *in* water are very different things, yet it is the same word *en*, that is used in both cases. If then they can take the liberty of changing the word into *in*, when translated *with*, have we not just as good a right to change it to *at*, when translated *in*, if such a change will equally well suit both the subject and the connexion? But they do change the translation from *with* to *in*, in this instance, and must necessarily do so, or abandon their cause; for the moment they admit that John baptized *with* water, instead of baptized *in* water, their exclusive system falls to the ground. The Greek word *en*, has the signification of *with*, in many instances; as in Math. 20; 15. "Is it not lawful for me to do what I will *with* (*en*) mine own?" Luke 14; 31. "Or what king, going to make war against another king, sitteth not down first, and consulteth whether he be able *with* (*en*) ten thousand, to meet him that cometh against him *with* twenty thousand?" I. Thes. 4; 18. "Where-

fore comfort one another with (*en*) these words." Baptizing *with* water then is as good a translation as baptizing *in* water, unless there is something in the particular case, that determines otherwise. In this case however "baptized with water" is the correct translation, as is manifest from its intimate connexion with the phrase, "baptize with the Holy Ghost."

The word *en* also signifies *to*, as, Col. 1; 23. "And be not moved away from the hope of the gospel, which ye have heard, and which was preached to (*en*) every creature under heaven." It also signifies near, or at. John 19; 41. "Now in the place where he was crucified, there was a garden," &c. The word rendered in, here, is the same word *en*; but it is manifest that its signification is *at* or *near*. Christ might have been crucified in a garden, but there could not be a garden in the place where he was crucified; nor was there; but "at or near to the place where he was crucified, there was a garden, and in the garden a new sepulchre, wherein was never man yet laid."

Now let the word in Mark 1; 5, already referred to, be translated at; "and were all baptized of him *at* the river of Jordan confessing their sins," and it will accord very well with the subject, it

will accord with the meaning of the word *baptidzo*, and it will accord with the translation in the following verses, "I indeed have baptized you *with* water, but he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost." *Baptidzo* as we have already shown, and it cannot be shown to be otherwise, means to wash or cleanse; and, of course, as applied to this ordinance, it is a symbolical washing or cleansing that is meant; for a literal washing or cleansing is not attempted by any. John might be baptizing at the river then, according to any of those "divers kinds of baptisms" of which the apostle speaks, and he would just be baptizing as he himself says, in the seventh verse, 'with water.'

But our opponents themselves must translate the Greek particle *en*, by, *at*, or have a contradiction between the inspired evangelists. Compare the first eleven verses of the first chapter of Mark, with the first chapter of John, from the fifteenth to the twenty-eighth verse, and it will easily be perceived, that they refer to the same thing, and relate the same circumstances. But Mark says that Jesus and all those multitudes were baptized *in* Jordan (that is according to this translation;) and John in the first chapter and twenty-eighth verse, referring to the same thing

says, "These things were done in Bethabara beyond Jordan." The word *in* here is just as plain as in Mark when applied to the Jordan, 'in Bethabara beyond Jordan.' Bethabara signifies 'the house of passage,' and was doubtless originally a house situated at the crossings of the river of Jordan: just what we would call the ferry house. Now if we take these words literally, they will teach us that John was baptizing in the ferry house beyond Jordan. But suppose that in process of time a town had grown up there, and taken the same name, as was doubtless the case; witness Harper's Ferry in our own country, then it will read that John was baptizing in the town of Bethabara beyond Jordan, while Mark (according to the translation) tells us, that he was baptizing in the river of Jordan. How upon baptist principles can these two historians be reconciled? and yet they are perfectly reconcilable, for they are both inspired, and both speak the truth. It will not do to suppose that this town, as is often the case with others, was situated on both sides of the river, and therefore to baptize in the town, and baptize in the river, might be represented as the same thing; for John expressly tells us that Bathabara was situated on the other side of the river, "beyond

Jordan." We cannot translate the word *en*, in the one case *in*, and in the other *at*, when in both cases it refers to the same thing, without using (to say the least of it) unwarrantable liberties with the word of God, and yet if we translate it, in both cases *in*, we have a palpable contradiction. Translate it however in both cases *at* and all is harmonious. The one states that John was baptizing at the river of Jordan, and the other that he was baptizing at Bethabara beyond Jordan. This is just such a discrepancy as we might expect to find between the testimony of two candid and honest witnesses. The one takes the river as a mark to point out John's locality, and the other takes the town, and had John been on the banks of the river, or at the water's edge, the one might truly say, that he was baptizing at the river, and the other as truly say, that he was baptizing at the town.

Look next at some examples of the word *eis*, sometimes translated into. Acts 8; 38. "And they went down both into (*eis*) the water, both Philip and the Eunuch; and he baptized him." But even if we admit that *eis* is correctly translated *into*, here, it will not prove that there was any immersion in the case, unless it can be shown that they could not go into the water for any

other purpose. Whether we translate *eis*, to, or into, it is manifest that whatever idea is intended to be conveyed by that word, was accomplished before the baptism took place. They went down *to* the water, or *into* the water, and then he baptized him; hence however we translate the word, it can determine nothing as to the mode in which the baptism was administered.

But it cannot be shown that *into* is the meaning of the word in this case, for it has also the signification of *to, with, unto, before, &c.* Math. 15; 24. "But he answered and said, I am not sent, but to (*eis*) the lost sheep of the house of Israel. He was not sent *into* the lost sheep of the house of Israel but to seek them out and save them, for he came to seek and to save them that were lost. John 11; 31. "She goeth to (*eis*) the grave to weep there." But she does not go *into* the grave or tomb, for we are told in the following verses* that it was a cave and a stone lay upon it; and that stone had to be removed before Lazarus came forth. John 20; 4. 'So they ran both together: and the other disciple did out run Peter, and came first to (*eis*) the sepulchre.—And he stooping down, and looking in, saw the linen clothes lying; *yet went he not in?*' *Eis* can-

*John 11; 38, 39.

not possibly mean *into* in this case—that he went into the sepulchre; because it is directly stated in the following verse, *that he went not in*. From these and other cases that might be adduced, it is evident, that it is nothing better than trifling to seek to determine any thing concerning the mode of baptism from the use of this word.

Next, look at the word *apo* sometimes translated, out of. Math. 3; 16. "And Jesus, when he was baptized, went up straightway out of (*apo*) the water." But, out of, so far from being the only meaning of the word *apo* here used, is not even its usual meaning. The radical and usual meaning of the word is, *from*, and it is so translated in several instances in almost immediate connexion with this verse. Math. 1; 17. "So all the generations from (*apo*) Abraham to David, are fourteen generations; and from (*apo*) David until the carrying away into Babylon, are fourteen generations; and from (*apo*) the carrying away into Babylon, unto Christ are fourteen generations." Math. 3; 7. "O generation of vipers, who hath warned you to flee from (*apo*) the wrath to come." The proper and usual meaning of the word is from; and the language here used imports nothing more whatever, than that Jesus when he was baptized went up from the

water. There is nothing in the narrative to prove that he was in the water even ankle deep. He might have been, and he might not; but all the proof on the subject, must be drawn from man's own imagination; for there is none in the language of the historian.

Look also for a moment at the word *ek*. This is the word that is used in reference to the Eunuch, when it is said, that when he was baptized he came up *out of* the water.* John 13; 4. "He riseth from (*ek*) supper, and laid aside his garments." Certainly he did not rise *out of* supper. Math. 19; 20. "All these things have I kept from (*ek*) my youth up." Acts 9; 33. "And there he found a certain man named Eneas, which had kept his bed eight years," (*eks eton okto,*) from eight years.

From these specimens, and we could give a hundred more, it will easily be perceived, how vain it is to depend upon these particles, to determine any thing of the mode in which baptism was administered. Even if we translate them all as our opponents wish, they will not prove any thing like immersion to have taken place; while they may all in perfect accordance

*Acts 8; 39,

with both the connexion, and the nature of the subject, be translated in a different manner.

But say our Baptist friends, *en* and *eis*, must mean in and into, because all those persons were immersed, and they could not be immersed without being *in* the water. Thus they take for granted that *baptidzo* means to immerse, and from it they determine the meaning of *en* and *eis*. But again, if they are pressed on the subject of immersion; they will say that those persons must have been immersed, for do you not see that they went into the water; and what would they go into the water for, but to be immersed. Thus they take for granted the meaning of *en* and *eis* and from them determine the meaning of *baptidzo*.

They first take for granted the meaning of *baptidzo*, and from it determine the meaning of *en* and *eis*; and then secondly from the meaning of *en* and *eis* thus determined, they determine the meaning of *baptidzo*. Thus they reason in a circle, and by such a process, they may prove any thing or nothing. Such prevarication and shuffling is altogether unworthy of a sacred cause.

Having thus then, directed your attention to the word by which this ordinance is designated,

and to those words that are used in connexion therewith; we shall in our next, examine the various places in which the administration of baptism is recorded, in the New Testament; and see whether there is any ground to believe, that it was administered by immersion.

DISCOURSE II.

Act^s, 9; 18. "And immediately there fell from his eyes as it had been scales; and he received sight forthwith, and arose and was baptized."

In a preceding discourse, we directed your attention to the mode of administering the ordinance of Baptism; and after some introductory remarks, concerning the unimportant nature of modes and forms, and the all important nature of a proper state of the heart and affections; we undertook to show, in the first place, the unfounded nature of the assumption, that immersion is the only scriptural and valid mode of its administration; and in the second place, that pouring or sprinkling, is the most proper, significant, and scriptural mode.

In taking up the first part of the subject we entered into an examination of the meaning of the words *Bapto*, and *Baptidzo*, which our opponents say, mean to immerse, and to immerse only. And

1st. We showed, that, even if our opponents were right in their interpretation of the word

baptidzo, that it means to immerse and only to immerse, that yet we are under no imperative obligation to adhere rigidly to that mode of administering the ordinance: from the fact, that the whole christian world, our Baptist friends among the rest, deviate very materially from the mode in which the sacrament of the supper was originally administered; and every one fail in coming up to the meaning of the word by which it is denominated, without ever being suspected of disregarding or abusing the ordinance; though that is equally a positive institution, and equally imperative with baptism: and from the additional fact, that the apostles did not adhere rigidly to the words of the institution of baptism, in a more important point than the mode of applying the water; for they did not baptize "in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; but in the name of the Lord, or in the name of Jesus Christ, or in the name of the Lord Jesus.

2d. We showed, that, to immerse, is not the only meaning, nor any meaning of the word *baptidzo*, as that word is used in the Holy Scriptures; but that to wash, or cleanse, is its meaning, without any reference to the manner in which it is performed. It is used for the wash-

ing or cleansing of hands before meals; it is used for the washing or cleansing of cups, and pots, and brazen vessels, and tables; it is used interchangeably with *nipto*, a word which invariably signifies to wash or to cleanse; it is used in opposition to *koinos*, impurity or defilement; and consequently refers to the removing of that defilement, by washing or cleansing; and it is used in reference to the various ceremonial cleansings that were practised among the Jews, and which consisted in washing, and pouring and sprinkling; but none of which consisted in immersion.

3d. We showed that the Greek words *en* and *eis*, *ek* and *apo* (frequently translated in and into, and out of) which are used in connexion with *baptidzo*, and on which so much stress is laid by our Baptist friends, may in every instance in which they occur in connexion with *baptidzo*, have a different signification, in perfect accordance with both the connexion and the subject; and consequently that nothing can be depended upon them, for determining the mode in which baptism was originally administered. We showed that the words may be rendered more correctly *at* the river, and *from* the river, than *in* the river and *out of*: that our opponents themselves,

must either translate the particle *en*, by *at*, (in one case at least) or have a contradiction between the evangelists: and that *ek* and *apo*, in every instance in which they occur in connexion with this subject, should be rendered *from*, instead of *out of*.

We shall now then direct your attention to an examination of the various places and circumstances in which baptism was administered, as recorded in the New Testament; and show, that there is nothing in them to render it evident, that it ever was administered by immersion; and that it is manifest that it was administered, in some instances at least, when it could not have been in that manner.

The places in which baptism was administered, as recorded in the New Testament, is the next strongest argument, to the meaning of the word *baptidzo*, on which our opponents are accustomed to rely, for sustaining their cause. Baptism say they, always took place at a certain river or stream; and some of you doubtless, have heard a broad and bold challenge given, to any individual, to show that baptism ever was performed at any other place, than some certain river or stream. We think we shall be able to show this to your full satisfaction before we are done. But,

in the mean time, how does the fact that baptism sometimes took place at ‘a certain river or stream,’ prove that the persons baptized were immersed in it? It manifestly cannot do so at all, but by assuming that *baptidzo* means to immerse, and to immerse only; for the moment it is admitted that *baptidzo* means any thing else, that moment it must be admitted, that it is absolutely uncertain whether there was any immersion in the case. But we have shown, and it cannot be shown to be otherwise, that *baptidzo* as used in the scriptures, does not mean to immerse at all; and if it is sometimes used in this sense by the Greek authors, it is also used by them in the sense of pouring or sprinkling. This being the case, it is only begging the question, to maintain, that, because baptism was administered at a certain river or stream, therefore it was administered by immersion. The utmost that can be said in favour of their cause from this fact is, that there, there was a good opportunity for immersion; but it can also be said, that there, there was a good opportunity for baptizing by pouring or sprinkling. The utmost advantage that they can derive from this is a probability in their favour, that, in as much as baptism was sometimes administered at ‘a certain river or

stream,' it is probable that it was administered by immersion; and all the probability consists in the fact, that there, there was a good opportunity for immersion.

But we must look at the several cases, in which baptism was administered at such a place, and see how strong the probability is; and whether there is not as strong, if not a stronger probability on the other side.

1. The baptism of John the Baptist is that on which the greatest stress is laid by our opponents, for sustaining their cause. It is said by Matthew, that "Jesus, when he was baptized, went up straightway out of the water;" and by Mark, that "there went out unto him all the land of Judea, and they of Jerusalem, and were all baptized of him in the river of Jordan, confessing their sins."*

This is dwelt upon perpetually, as evidence that John's baptism was administered by immersion. Now it is manifest to every thinking individual, that this record cannot *prove* immersion, in any other way than by taking for granted that *baptidzo* means to immerse. But this we have shown to be otherwise. By an examination of

*Math. 3; 16. Mark 1; 5.

those passages in which the word occurs disconnected with this ordinance, we have shown its meaning as used in the scripture to be, to wash, or cleanse; and of course as applied to this ordinance, it is a symbolical washing or cleansing, for a literal cleansing is not pretended by any. And whenever we look at the original words here translated *in* and *out of*, we find that they import nothing whatever more, than that the individuals spoken of were at the water, and came from it. The whole amount of evidence then, which can be gathered from this record is a mere probability that John immersed; and that probability arises solely from the fact, that there he had a good opportunity for so doing.

1. But who does not know, that John might have taken his station by the Jordan, or at Enon, where there was much water, or as it is in the original, where there were many streams of water,* on other accounts, than for the purpose of immersion? John the Baptist was a poor man, travelling about in the wilderness of Judea, living on locusts and wild honey, and possessing no settled habitation. He began in the wilderness of Judea to preach the baptism of repentance; and Mark tells us in his first chapter and

* "Hoti hudata polla een ekei." John 3; 23.

fourth verse, that he baptized in the wilderness. As his audience increased—as the fame of this wonderful man drew immense assemblies around him, (for there “went out to him all the land of Judea, and they of Jerusalem, and all the region round about Jordan;) it would become a matter of imperious necessity that he should remove his station, to some place, where so vast an assemblage could obtain the means of subsistence. But what would be more necessary to their subsistence, than a plentiful supply of water? Hence the neighborhood of Jordan, or Enon, where there were many streams, would be absolutely necessary for the accommodation of so great a multitude.

Do you ever find even a camp meeting ground selected, without making a plentiful supply of water, a prominent object; and what are all the crowds that assemble there, to the multitudes of people, and camels, and beasts of burden, that were from day to day, and from month to month, surrounding this wonderful man. You know what importance Abraham and Lot, and the other patriarchs, attached to a well or spring of water, around which to encamp, with the comparatively small numbers that were in their company. You know what distress the Israel-

ites were often in for want of water, when journeying through the wilderness. Is it to be wondered at then, that John the Baptist, having people flocking to his preaching by thousands and tens of thousands, should find it necessary, to take his station where there was a plentiful supply of water, and that the historian should notice the fact? At least we think the probability (for it is only a probability on either side) is just as great, that this was the purpose for which such a position was selected, as that it was for the purpose of immersion. At any rate, it ill becomes our opponents to plead, that immersion was the purpose, for which John took his station at the Jordan or at Enon: seeing they themselves are ready to assert, in answer to the objection to the mode of baptism, arising from the difficulty in many places of the world, of obtaining a sufficient supply of water for that purpose, that, "Wherever man has pitched his tent, there, there may be a sufficient supply of water obtained for the purpose of immersion." They tell us, that John took his station at Jordan or at Enon, that he might have a sufficiency of water to immerse: and yet whenever we suggest the difficulty of obtaining a sufficiency of water at different seasons of the year, in

many places of the world, they tell us, that, "wherever man has pitched his tent, there, there may be a sufficiency of water obtained for that purpose." The probability however that John took his station where there was plenty of water, for the purpose of immersion, is fully counterbalanced by the other probability that he took his station there, for the purposes we have mentioned.

2. But further, there are two or three improbabilities to place over against this probability:

1st. There is no notice taken of any preparation for this ordinance in the way of suitable clothing or otherwise. It is improbable that the multitude whom John baptized were all immersed in their wearing apparel, for this would certainly have been most prejudicial to health; and yet there is no notice taken either here, or in any other case of baptism that is recorded in the New Testament, of laying aside the clothes for that purpose. It is true, they might have put off their clothes without it having been mentioned by the historian. But we say it is improbable, that this circumstance would not have been mentioned, in connexion with some of the many cases of baptism recorded in the New Testament. It is said of Jesus, that when about

to wash his disciples feet, "*he laid aside his garments*; and took a towel, and girded himself." It is said of those who stoned Stephen, that "*they laid down their clothes* at a young man's feet, whose name was Saul." And it is said of the persecutors of Paul himself, that they "cried out, and *cast off their clothes*, and threw dust into the air."* Now here is the circumstance of laying aside the clothes, particularly mentioned, in cases in which we cannot suppose it was more important to be noticed, than where thousands of people, at different times, and in different circumstances, were to be plunged over head and ears in water. The probability is therefore, that no such ceremony as putting off the clothes took place, and as it is improbable that they were immersed in their wearing apparel, it is improbable that they were immersed at all.

2d. There is another improbability. It arises from the fact presented in our last discourse, viz: that baptisms were performed by the Jews long before the days of John, even from the commencement of the Jewish economy. The apostle calls them "divers baptisms," and those as we showed you consisted in washing, and pour-

*John 13; 4. Acts 7; 58. Acts 22; 23.

ing, and sprinkling, but none of them consisted in immersion. Is it not improbable then, that John should have baptized in a manner different from those ‘divers baptisms,’ that were so commonly practised among the Jews, and which must therefore have been new to them, without any notice having been taken of it by the historian.

3d. But there is another, and greater improbability still. It is that John should have been able to immerse the multitudes that flocked to his baptism---that he should have had physical strength for the performance of such a task. It will not do to suppose, that, though there flocked multitudes to his preaching, that probably but a small part of those multitudes were baptized; for Mark expressly says, “there went out to him all the land of Judea, and they of Jerusalem, and were *all* baptized of him, in (or at) the river of Jordan, confessing their sins.” Nor will it do to suppose, as some who are more ingenious than candid have done, that John only heard their confessions, and then they baptized themselves; for the record tells us, that they were all baptized *of* John: *hupo*, a word which when governing the genitive, as in this case, properly signifies *by*, denoting either the efficient or in-

strumental cause, by which any thing is done. They were all baptized *of*, or *by* John confessing their sins.

Some have computed the multitudes baptized by John to be fully two millions;* but if we take even the twentieth part of that number, we will have one hundred thousand; and certainly we cannot suppose the number to be much less than this, to correspond at all with the language of the Evangelist. "All Judea, and Jerusalem, and the region round about Jordan." Jerusalem must have had four or five times that number of inhabitants itself, not to speak of all the land of Judea, and the populous country along the Jordan. As however we cannot suppose that every individual went to his baptism, for the scriptures often use general language in this manner, when it is not intended to be taken universally; let us take the number at one hundred thousand, and this is certainly as low an estimate as the language of the evangelist will allow us to make. Now how long was John engaged in his work of preaching and baptizing? just about one year and a half. From the time that John began to preach the baptism of repentance in the wilderness of Judea, until his im-

*See Miller on Baptism, page 72.

prisonment by Herod, was just about a year and a half. For John then, to have immersed all those multitudes, in that space of time, he must have immersed about two hundred persons every day, without intermission, during the whole period of his public ministry. Now this presents not only an improbability, but an impossibility. That any man should have stood from morning till night, up to the middle in water, day after day, for five hundred days in succession, and put forth the strength that would be necessarily called forth to immerse many of those who came to his baptism, we have no hesitation in saying is utterly impossible. Even if we reduce the number one half, which is far below what the language of the historians would lead us to believe, the case is impossible still. So that there is not only an improbability in the way, but a stubborn impossibility. It is improbable then that John ever immersed a single individual, and that he immersed all the multitudes whom he is represented as having baptized, is altogether impossible.

All the evidence then, that John baptized by immersion, arises either from the assumption that *baptidzo* means to immerse, and to immerse only; or from the probability, afforded by the

fact, that he baptized where there was plenty of water. The first we have already shown to be an assumption altogether unfounded; and the second—the probability, is counterbalanced by the other probability, that he might have taken his station there for altogether different reasons; and is overpowered by the improbability, that he should have baptized in this manner, and yet no notice have been taken of any preparations made for it, in the way of dress or otherwise; by the improbability that he should have baptized in a manner entirely new to the Jews, without it being noticed by the historian; and by the impossibility of his immersing all whom he is represented as having baptized. We say then that there is no evidence that John ever immersed a single individual. It is improbable that he ever immersed any, and it is utterly impossible that he should have immersed all.

II. The case of baptism on which the next greatest stress is laid by our opponents, is that of the Eunuch, baptized by Philip the evangelist. But neither will this case if properly considered, afford any clear evidence in their favour.

What are the grounds on which it is supposed that the Eunuch was immersed? First, the assumption that *baptidzo* means to immerse, and

nothing else; for if it means any thing else at all, it can afford no evidence in their favour. Secondly, the fact there was water there; and thirdly, the translation of the statement, that they went into, and came out of it. Well, the first of these will not avail them; for it cannot be proved that *baptidzo* means to immerse only, or to immerse at all, as it is used in the Scriptures; and we have already sufficiently proved that it does not. The third will not avail them, viz.: the statement that they went into the water and came up out of it, for they themselves know (at least those who are scholars among them) that the words translated *into* and *out of*, import nothing more, than that they went *to* the water and came *from* it. Nor will the second avail them, that there was water there; for there is no evidence whatever, that there was a sufficiency of water for that purpose. It is not said, "Here is plenty of water, or here is a sufficiency of water;" but simply, "here is water;" and this language, as well as all the circumstances of the case, combine to render it probable, that it was but a very small stream. The narrative of the whole matter we have in Acts 8; 26---40. "And the angel of the Lord spake unto Philip, saying, Arise, and go toward the south, unto the way

that goeth down from Jerusalem to Gaza, which is desert," &c. Philip had been preaching the gospel in Samaria, and from this he was directed by the angel of God to go southward, to the road that led down from Jerusalem to Gaza; and to that part of the road that led through the desert. It has been supposed by some, that the word desert, here, refers to Gaza, as situated in a desert. But this will not suit the facts of the case. Modern travellers tell us that Gaza is very pleasantly situated; and the bible informs us that it was anciently a city of considerable importance. It was the residence of one of the five lords of the Philistines, and the scene of many of Samson's transactions, and of his death. It was also a city having towns and villages around it, and dependant upon it; Joshua 15; 47. "Ashdod, with her towns, and her villages, *Gaza, with her towns and her villages.*" Besides, if the word desert refers to Gaza, there could be no necessity for its being used here at all. There could be no necessity, nor even propriety, in describing the situation of Gaza, seeing it was not to Gaza, he was to go; but to some part of the road that led from Jerusalem to this place. But if the word desert refers to the road, then it was a necessary and definite part of

Philip's instructions. He was to go to that part of the road leading from Jerusalem to Gaza, which passed through the desert.

Such then was the locality of Philip and the Eunuch's interview. It was on a road that led through a desert, where little or no water was to be expected, and which renders it utterly improbable, that the first stream they came to, would be of sufficient size and depth, to admit of immersion. The narrative certainly gives the impression that this was the first water they had seen since their interview, or at least since Philip's exposition of the doctrines and ordinances of the Gospel. "And as they went on their way they came to a certain water," *epi ti hudor*, upon some water; and the impression that is commonly attempted to be made from this language, that it was some considerable river or stream, is wholly without foundation.

Let us look for a moment at the original words; *epi ti hudor*. *Hudor*, is not a word that signifies a river or stream, nor is it ever used in the New Testament for that purpose. The word for river or stream is *potamos*, but *hudor* simply signifies water.* the previous word, *ti*, (in

**Potamos* is the word that is always used in the New Testament for river or stream. See Mark 1; 5. Acts 16; 13. Rev. 22; 1, 2. John 7; 38. Rev. 8; 10; &c.

the form in which it is here found,) is just a word which signifies *some*, *ti hudor*, some water.—And the first of the three, *epi*, signifies upon; and hence literally translated, it would be *they came upon some water*. Now this is just the very form of expression, which we ourselves are accustomed to use, when we come unexpectedly upon any thing. If we have some particular place in view, towards which we direct our journey, when we arrive, we say we have come *to* it. But if we find any thing unexpectedly by the way, we say we come *upon* it.

The expression of the Eunuch also, plainly implies that it was an unexpected circumstance to find water in that place. It is an abrupt burst of surprise, “Lo! water.” The words “*here is*,” you will perceive, by looking at your bibles, are printed in italics, to show that they are a supplement--not contained in the original; and the word rendered “see,” is an adverb; in Latin, *ecce*; a word of surprise. “As they went on their way, they came upon some water; and the Eunuch said Lo! water, what doth hinder me to be baptized.”

And further, that part of the prophecy of Isaiah, which the Eunuch had just been reading, and from which Philip preached to him Jesus,

contained this remarkable prophecy of Jesus, “So shall he sprinkle many nations;” and is it not more than probable, that the mode of baptism here, would have been in accordance with that prophecy of Christ, found in immediate connexion with the very place to which their attention had been directed, rather than in a manner that was not alluded to in the prophecy at all? The whole circumstances of the case. The desert in which it occurred. The expression “came upon some water.” The abrupt exclamation of surprise at seeing water in this place; together with an allusion to a different mode of baptism, in connexion with the very passage of scripture which they were considering, all unite in rendering it very improbable, that there was any thing like immersion here; and certainly it never can be proved that there was.

III. Look next at the case of Lydia, recorded in Acts 16; 13—15. “And on the Sabbath we went out of the city by a river side, where prayer was wont to be made; and we sat down and spake unto the women which resorted thither. &c.” This is the only remaining case recorded in the New Testament, in which there is any reason to suppose that baptism took place at any river or stream; and here there is not the smal-

lest evidence that it was administered by immersion. It is probable that Lydia was baptized at the river; because, there was where the Lord opened her heart; there she was converted unto the Lord; and it is probable that she was baptized, and added to the disciples on the spot. But there is nothing whatever to render it probable, at least there is not the shadow of evidence, that she was immersed. It was not for that purpose that the apostles went to the river, but for the purpose of preaching the gospel. Because there prayer was wont to be made; there the people were accustomed to assemble; and there they would have an opportunity of speaking unto them in the name of the Lord Jesus. Being there, Lydia was converted to the Lord, and doubtless was baptized forthwith. But whether it was by going to, and using the water of the river, or by having water brought from the river, there is nothing said; and certainly there is not the most distant hint that she was immersed.

Now after all the boasting and challenging which we sometimes hear, for any one to show a place where baptism was administered, but at a certain river or stream, these are the only three cases on record, in which it was administered at such a place; and in not one of them is there

any evidence, that it was administered by immersion.

We shall next turn your attention to the other prominent recorded cases of baptism, in the New Testament, not one of which took place at ‘a certain river or stream.’

IV. Look then at the case of the three thousand on the day of Pentecost. Acts 2; 38---41. “Then Peter said unto them, repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins; and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. For the promise is to you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call. And with many other words did he testify and exhort, saying, save yourselves from this untoward generation. Then they that gladly received his word were baptized; and the same day they there were added unto the church about three thousand souls.” At the commencement of the chapter, we are told that “when the day of Pentecost was fully come, they were all with one accord in one place. And suddenly there came a sound from heaven, as of a rushing mighty wind, and it filled all the house where they were sitting,” &c. It is not certain whether the disciples were at this time assem-

bled in any particular part of the temple, or in a private house. It is probable however that they were assembled in one of the numerous apartments of the temple, but this is not material. When the wonderful circumstance that had happened, and the miraculous power with which the disciples were endowed, came to be noised abroad, multitudes of people crowded around them, to see and hear those wonderful things. The apostle Peter addressed this multitude in a discourse of considerable length; in which, from the scriptures of the Old Testament, he proved that Jesus was the Christ, the Saviour of men; that he had been delivered by God, to be put to death for our sins; and that they, to whom he was speaking, were guilty of crucifying the Lord of Glory. This discourse, through the influence of that same Spirit which had descended on the disciples themselves, made a powerful impression upon the minds of the hearers. It carried pungent conviction to their consciences, and made them cry out, "Men and brethren what shall we do?" The apostle directed them to repent and be baptized, and we are told that "they that gladly received his word were baptized, and the same day, there were added unto them about three thousand souls."

Now there are several things, that render it very improbable, that those three thousand that were on that day baptized, and added to the church, were immersed.

1st. There is no mention of their leaving the place where they were, for that purpose. Not the smallest indication in the narrative, that they made any movement towards where water might be obtained, nor any preparation for such an undertaking, as the immersion of three thousand persons would have been. Now I venture to say that there is none of our Baptist friends, who would undertake to write out the history of their denomination in any particular place, who would fail to notice, the repairing of their first converts to a neighboring brook for this purpose, if such movement had taken place. Yet here is the sacred historian, giving an account of the commencement of Christianity--the very beginning of the impressions which it made upon the multitude, and the success which it had among them; making not the most distant allusion, to such a scene, as the turning out of three thousand persons, together with all the friends who might accompany them, and the multitudes of spectators whom curiosity would naturally draw after them, to some neighboring brook or stream,

would have been. The unavoidable inference from this, is, that no such scene took place.

2d. The multitudes that assembled together from curiosity or any other motive, could not know what was about to happen. They could not have known that they would there be pricked in their hearts, led to cry out men and brethren what shall we do, and then submit to the ordinance of baptism before they left the ground. Many of them too, were poor people, and strangers at Jerusalem, and consequently would not be prepared with any suitable dress or change of raiment for the purpose. We cannot suppose the indecency of men and women promiscuously laying aside their clothes for this purpose. Nor can we suppose that they were all immersed in their wearing apparel and remained on the ground in such a condition. We see what preparations are made for a single case of immersion, by those who practise it in the present day; and what efforts are made to have the individual speedily warmed and dried, lest any thing prejudicial to health should occur, and thereby a bad report be raised against the practice. But here there could have been no preparations made, for no individual knew that such a scene was to take place. And besides, who were

there, to warm, and dry, and look after the comfort, of such a multitude as this; the great majority of whom were so poor, that but a few days after, the wealthier disciples had to sell their property, and cast their money into a common fund, for their subsistence?

3d. There is another obstacle in the way. There was no place near to Jerusalem, that would, at that season of the year, have afforded water sufficient for such a purpose. The brook Kidron is the only stream of any consequence that is near to Jerusalem, and it is either almost, or wholly dry, a considerable part of the year; and is so at the very season of the year in which this event occurred. The most credible travellers tell us, that, except during the early or the latter rains, or sometimes during the winter, when the brook flows impetuously, it is at other seasons of the year generally dry. And Pentecost was just at that season of the year, when, for months together, there is not a cloud in the sky.

Now observe, we do not say that there were not accommodations about Jerusalem, at this season, for the immersion of one individual, or of three thousand individuals in succession—provided sufficient time was allowed for the pur-

pose. But we do say, that there was no place near to Jerusalem that would at this season have afforded accommodation for the immersion of three thousand individuals, in the length of time, that the narrative will allow us to conclude was left for that purpose. The apostle Peter commenced his discourse to the multitude at nine o'clock in the morning, and from the skeleton of his sermon that is given—from the inquiries that were put by the multitude concerning their salvation, together with the answers that were returned—and from the statement, that, “with many other words did he teach and exhort,” we cannot suppose that all this would have occupied less time than to the middle of the day. There was only the afternoon left then, for the immersion of three thousand individuals; for the narrative tells us they were added to the church the same day. Now suppose the twelve apostles and the whole seventy evangelists are all engaged in this work, and they will have, some thirty-six, and others thirty-seven cases each; and any one who has ever witnessed the ceremony of immersion, much more those who have ever tried it, knows that this would be quite a sufficient task for a whole day. But they have only the afternoon to it; and the whole eighty-

two must be engaged, and engaged with vigour, else it will not be accomplished. Now we have no hesitation in saying that there was no place in or about Jerusalem, that would, at that season of the year, have sufficed for such a purpose.

It is also altogether improbable that any artificial means could have been provided, for the disciples or no one else knew that such an outpouring of the spirit was about to take place, or that any such preparations would be necessary. The whole drift of the narrative, shows, that the event was sudden, wholly unlooked for, and unexpected, by the apostles themselves. The fact then that there was no place in the neighborhood of Jerusalem that would, at that season of year, have sufficed for such a purpose, together with the fact, that the event was wholly unexpected by the apostles themselves, and consequently they could have made no adequate artificial preparations, render it exceedingly improbable, that there was any immersion took place.

The latest edition which we have heard of the mode of getting round the difficulty, arising from the want of water, at that season of the year, for the immersion of such a multitude, in

so short a time, is, to say that there was water enough in the temple for that purpose. Yes, it is said, "there was water enough in the temple for the immersion of *thirty thousand*." And although it is not said that they were immersed there, for no one who has the smallest regard for his own reputation, would hazard such an expression; yet, the insinuating impression is endeavoured to be made, that there, they were immersed.

Now this we think the most improbable of all; and it may be worth while to look at it for a moment. In the first place there is no evidence what quantity of water was at that time kept in the temple; and in the second place, what was kept there, was kept for particular purposes. And though there might have been a sufficient quantity obtained from the receptacles in the temple, or soon brought thither in some other manner, for the purpose of baptizing the whole number by pouring or sprinkling; it is altogether improbable, that there could have been any such a scene, as the immersion of three thousand persons, going on in the temple.

In Ex. 30; 17---31, we have an account of the provision that was made for the keeping of water in the tabernacle, and the use to which it

was applied, before the temple was built. "And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, Thou shalt also make a laver of brass, and his foot of brass, to wash withal: and thou shalt put it between the tabernacle of the congregation and the altar, and thou shalt put water therein: For Aaron and his sons shall wash their hands and their feet thereat. When they go into the tabernacle of the congregation, they shall wash with water, that they die not; or when they come near to the altar to minister, to burn offering made by fire unto the Lord; So shall they wash their hands and their feet, that they die not: and it shall be a statute for ever to them, even to him and to his seed throughout their generations." The water that was kept in the tabernacle was but a small quantity; and it was kept for the purpose of washing the hands and the feet of the priests, when they went in to minister before the Lord.

When the temple of Solomon was built, every thing was on a large scale; and among other things, a much larger provision was made for retaining a supply of water, than had existed in the tabernacle. In I. Kings 7; 23--39, and II. Chron. 4; 2--6, we are told that there was a large cistern of molten brass, called a brazen sea, of about fifteen yards diameter, and capable

of containing two thousand baths. This brazen sea was set upon the backs of twelve molten oxen, havjng their heads outward, and their hinder parts inward; three of them looking toward the north, and three looking toward the south; three looking toward the east, and three looking toward the west. Besides this there were ten lavers of brass, each of about two yards long, placed five on each side of the brazen sea, and set upon wheels, so that they might be moved as convenience might require. The purpose for which this water was retained was for the priests to wash in, and for the washing of such things as were offered in sacrifice. In reference to the ten lavers it is said: "Such things as they offered for the burnt-offering they washed in them: but the sea was for the priests to wash in."* Of course to wash according to the perpetual ordinance which God had appointed, viz: "To wash their hands and their feet thereat."†

What quantity of water was retained in the second temple we are no where told; but as every thing in and about that temple was on a small scale, compared with the temple of Solomon; so much so, as to cause the old men to

* 2 Chron. 4; 5. †Ex. 30; 19---27.

weep, after they saw its foundation laid, when they remembered the temple that had preceded it;‡ we may justly infer, that the preparations for water, would be on a proportionably smaller scale. But suppose there was an equal provision made for a supply of water in the second temple as in the first; will we have any thing like accommodations, for the immersion of three thousand persons, in one afternoon? We have seen that if the twelve apostles, and the seventy evangelists are all engaged in the work, they will have thirty-six, or thirty-seven cases each. They must *all* be engaged then, and engaged vigorously, else it will not be accomplished within the time. Well, we may perhaps find room for one operator on each side of each of the ten lavers, which will be accommodations for twenty; and if we can get suitable scaffolding erected, we may perhaps find room for twelve more around the brazen sea, for it was about fifteen yards in circumference. Thus we have accommodations for thirty-two, and it is all that can be found; but this is not one-half of the number that must be engaged, before there can be any possibility of the work being accomplished.

At any rate we are expressly told in the law

‡Ezra 3; 12---13.

of the Lord for what purpose this water was there retained. It was for the priests who officiated in the temple to wash with, and for the washing of the sacrifices. The temple services were continually going on. Some of the priests were daily ministering before the Lord; and sacrifices were offered regularly, every morning and evening; besides all the occasional, and voluntary sacrifices, that were continually a presenting. That the disciples then would either have been suffered, or would have sought, to immerse such a multitude in the water that was especially set apart for the priests and the sacrifices, is altogether improbable. They must have driven the priests from their places, and arrested the offering of the daily sacrifice, by such a procedure. That there could have been such a scene of plunging going on in the temple, is one of the most improbable, of all improbable things. It is perfectly ridiculous; and the most distant allusion to it, can only be made for the purpose of blinding the eyes of men, and covering up the deformities of a bad cause.

Here again, look at another of the inconsistencies of our opponents. At the same time that it is intimated that the immersion of all this multitude took place in the temple, for, say they, there

was water enough there, for the immersion of thirty thousand, we are boldly challenged to show an instance from scripture, in which baptism took place, but at a ‘certain water or stream.’ They themselves have just furnished us with a very good example to our hand.

V. Next, look at the baptism of Saul, Acts 9; 18. “And immediately there fell from his eyes as it had been scales; and he received sight forthwith, and arose and was baptized.” Saul, by the vision that he had seen on his way to Damascus, was deprived of sight, and had to be led by the hand into the city, and remained three days in that condition without eating or drinking. In this blind and debilitated state, Ananias, by the direction of the Lord Jesus Christ, visited him. Ananias laid his hands upon him, and he received his sight forthwith, and arose and was baptized. Here then is a case for those who wish one, in which baptism did not take place at a certain river or stream, but in a private house. The whole narrative tells us as plainly as can be, that Saul was baptized there on the spot. The original is still more expressive of this truth than the translation. It is *anastas ebaptisthee*, he stood up and was baptized. I defy any individual to express more clear-

ly and definitely, by any equal number of words in the Greek language, the idea that the apostle Paul was baptized standing on his feet, than these words do. Here then is as manifest an overthrow as can be, of the assumption that *baptidzo* always means to immerse, and nothing else. Who ever heard of a man being immersed standing on his feet? Are our Baptist friends in the habit of immersing in this way? If not, they do not baptize as the apostle Paul was baptized for he stood up and was baptized. Here then is a clear case in which baptism was not administered at a certain river or stream, and a clear case in which it was not administered by immersion. And while our opponents cannot produce one clear case in which baptism was administered by immersion, here is one in which it is as clear as noon day, that it *was not administered* by immersion: *kai anastas e^{baptisthee}*, and having stood up he was baptized.

VI. Again, look at the case of the Centurion and his friends. Acts 10; 46. "Then answered Peter, can any man forbid water that these should not be baptized which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we? And he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord." Peter by the direction of the Holy Ghost and

the invitation he had received from Cornelius had travelled from Joppa to Cesarea to pay him a visit. Having arrived and enquired the cause for which he had been sent for; he received from the Centurion an account of the vision which he had seen, and the direction he had received to send for Peter, who should tell him words whereby he and all his house should be saved. Peter, on hearing this, immediately commenced and preached to him the gospel, and while he spoke, the Holy Ghost fell on all them which heard the word. It was a matter of astonishment both to Peter and to them that were with him, that on the gentiles was poured out the gift of the Holy Ghost. But witnessing this, he exclaims can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, who have received the Holy Ghost as well as we? And he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord. Is there in this narrative the smallest allusion to immersion? Is there a single turn of expression that looks like as if immersion had been performed? Is there any intimation of any movement to where water was to be found? on the contrary there is intimation of water being brought to where they were. ‘Can any man forbid water?’ What is the import of this language? Does it

mean, "Can any man prohibit us from going to where the water is"? or does it not rather mean, "Can any man prohibit water from being brought to us?" This is just such language as we might expect to be used in case baptism was to be administered by pouring or sprinkling. Can any man forbid water to be brought and used for this purpose?

There is another consideration of some weight connected with this case. On Cornelius and his friends, had just been poured out the gift of the Holy Ghost, which was the circumstance that determined the apostle to admit them as subjects of baptism. "Can any man forbid water that these should not be baptized *who have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?*" But baptism is symbolical of the cleansing influences of the Holy Ghost; for Christ himself had said in reference to the pouring out of the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost, "Ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost, not many days hence," and here these persons had received the Holy Spirit, in the same manner, as the disciples on that day; consequently they too were baptized with the Holy Ghost. But how were they baptized with the Holy Ghost? It was by the Holy Ghost being poured out upon them. Is it not most proba-

ble then, that water was used in that manner, which would more nearly resemble the manner, in which they had just been baptized with the Holy Ghost? They were not immersed in the Holy Ghost; but the Holy Ghost was poured out upon them. They were not applied to the Holy Ghost; but the Holy Ghost applied to them. This then in connexion with the language of the apostle, and the whole drift of the narrative, renders it altogether probable, nay exceedingly plain, that there was no immersion in the case.

The fact of the apostle's commanding them to be baptized, instead of baptizing them himself, may be accounted for in the same manner, in which the apostle Paul accounted for the fewness of the number that he baptized, viz: lest any one should say that he baptized in his own name. And here again we might ask our friends to tell us at what certain river or stream this baptism took place; and to say how they can maintain in view of this and the previous case, that *baptidzo* always means to immerse and nothing else.

VII. There is only one other case of baptism to which we will call your attention. It is that of the jailor and his family, recorded in Acts 16; 29--33. Neither, when we examine *this* case, will we find the smallest evidence that it was

administered by immersion. It was at the dead hour of night that an earthquake occurred, shaking the foundations, and throwing open the doors of the prison, in which the disciples were confined, and releasing them from the bonds in which they were bound. The jailor awaking from his sleep, and fearing that his prisoners had escaped, and well knowing the consequences to himself had this been the case, drew his sword, and would have killed himself. From this he was prevented by Paul and Silas calling to him, and assuring him, that they were all safe; "Do thy self no harm for we are all here." Under feelings of powerful conviction, he enquired earnestly concerning his salvation; "Sirs, what must I do to be saved?" and received for answer, the direction, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved and thy house." He then, it is said, "Took them the same hour of the night, and washed their stripes; and was baptized, he and all his, straightway." Is there the smallest intimation here that this baptism was administered by immersion? Is there any intimation of their leaving the jail for that purpose, or is it probable that they would steal out of the prison at midnight to look out a suitable place for immersion? Is it probable considering the dread in

which the jailer was, lest any of his prisoners had escaped, that *he* would have made such a venture. Even if he had had ever so much confidence in the disciples, would he have run the risk of being seen by others, in such a situation? Or is it probable that the disciples themselves would have so acted—those disciples who would not depart from the prison in which they had been unjustly confined even when permitted to do so, until those magistrates who had unjustly imprisoned them, came and brought them out? Or will the narrative allow us to suppose that there was time for such a proceeding? when it is said, “He took them *the same hour of the night* and washed their stripes; *and was baptized he and all his straightway.*” Well, is it probable as some have supposed that they had in the jail in Philippi any preparations for such an event? an event that had never occurred before and was not likely ever to occur again? Those who can suppose so, must draw largely upon their imagination in lack of argument. And the assumption that baths or pools for bathing, were common in houses in those places, is wholly without foundation.—Philippi was situated between the forty first and forty second degrees of north latitude, lying about one degree north of where we now are, and con-

sequently was possessed of at least as cold a climate as ours: and certainly a baptistry or bathing tub is not considered so very indispensable an appendage to every family in this climate. Nor was it there. There is not the smallest evidence that such a thing was common. There is no mention made of it in any works that were published near to that period. It is merely an invention of later days to suit a purpose.

Thus then, we have examined all the prominent cases of baptism recorded in the New Testament, and have not found one, in which it is evident, that it was administered by immersion; but, on the contrary, we have seen that there are several cases, in which it is evident, that it was not administered in that manner.

There is one other consideration of no small weight, to which we shall just advert before concluding this part of the subject. There is no case of baptism recorded in the New Testament, in which there is the smallest hint, that the individuals to be baptized were required to repair to any particular place for that purpose. But all the cases of baptism that are recorded, are represented as having been administered forthwith—on the spot—in the place where the persons heard the gospel, and where they were brought

under its influence. Now this is perfectly unaccountable, on the supposition that it was always administered by immersion. There must have been times and places, in which it would have been necessary to repair to a considerable distance, to obtain the necessary accommodations; but nowhere, is there the smallest allusion to such a movement. In our own country, which is perhaps tenfold better supplied with water, than the land of Judea, those who practise immersion, are almost always under the necessity of repairing to some particular place for that purpose; but no such movement is hinted at in the word of God. If baptism in one or two instances was administered at a certain river or stream, it was because that there, the individuals heard the word of God; there, they were brought under its influence, and converted to christianity. But there is not one instance of their repairing to any stream for the purpose of baptism, after they had been converted. Where they heard the word and yielded to its influence, there, they were baptized; whether it was by a river side, as in the case of Lydia; or on the highway, as in the case of the Eunuch; or in a private house, as in the case of Saul. This we again remark is altogether unaccountable, on the supposition

that baptism was always administered by immersion.

We fear not to hazard the expression, that there is no clear case recorded in the word of God, either in the Old or in the New Testament, of one individual having been immersed by another, as a religious ordinance. Indeed we do not at present remember a case of one individual having been immersed by another at all, whether as a religious ceremony or not, unless it be the case of Jonah. He was truly immersed; and our friends are welcome to all the aid that his case will afford them.

DISCOURSE III.

1 Cor. 10; 1, 2. "Moreover, brethren, I would not that ye should be ignorant, how that all our fathers were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea; And were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea."

Having already examined the meaning of the word *baptidzo*, by which this ordinance is designated, together with the various particles that are used in connexion with it; and having also examined the various accounts that are given of the administration of baptism in the New Testament, and found that neither in the meaning of the original word, nor in the places or circumstances in which the ordinance was administered, is there any thing to support the peculiar and exclusive views of Baptists; we shall next direct your attention to the figurative language used in scripture in reference to this ordinance, or the allusions that are made to it, and on which so much stress is usually laid by our opponents.

1. Cor. 10; 2. "And were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea." Is there any thing of immersion in this verse? Does the apostle mean to teach, that the Israelites were immersed in the cloud and in the sea? and yet this is the meaning that many of our opponents

attach to this language. We must look at the narrative of the transaction here referred to, and see whether there is any ground to suppose that immersion took place, for we know that the apostle cannot give a different representation, from the facts, as they are previously recorded in the word of God. Ex. 14; 19—22. “And the angel of God, which went before the camp of Israel, removed and went behind them; and the pillar of the cloud went from before their face, and stood behind them. And it came between the camp of the Egyptians and the camp of Israel; and it was a cloud and darkness to them, but it gave light by night to these: so that the one came not near the other all the night. And Moses stretched out his hand over the sea; and the Lord caused the sea to go back by a strong east wind all that night, and made the sea dry land, and the waters were divided. And the children of Israel went into the midst of the sea upon the dry ground; and the waters were a wall unto them on their right hand and on their left.” Here we are told, that the cloud which had previously gone before the Israelites, to guide them on their way, removed and stood behind them, so as to prove a barrier between them and the Egyptians; and that when the Lord cau-

sed the sea to go back by a strong east wind, the children of Israel passed through on dry land, having the waters for a wall to them on the right hand and on the left. Here, there is most assuredly nothing of immersion; nor is there any thing in this narrative that would enable us to account for the apostle's use of the word baptism in reference to it. We have however something additional in the 77th Psalm 16-20. "The waters saw thee, O God, the waters saw thee: they were afraid; the depths also were troubled. *The clouds poured out water;* the skies sent out a sound; their arrows also went abroad." In these verses we are informed that the cloud which had previously gone before the children of Israel, in removing to a position behind them, had discharged more or less of a shower of rain. This then is the circumstance in reference to which the apostle uses the word baptized. The cloud in passing over their heads sprinkled them with its waters. And if in passing through the sea they were sprinkled with some of the spray, this is the utmost that we can suppose; for the narrative expressly tells us that they went through on dry ground. In this place, then, we have the word baptism used, when it is plain there can be no immersion

intended. The Egyptians were immersed, but the Israelites went through on dry ground.

As however, in baptism, we came under solemn obligations to the Lord, to obey and serve him; so the children of Israel, in experiencing this remarkable deliverance from their enemies, which God wrought for them at the Red Sea, by the hand of Moses, were thereby brought under solemn obligation to obey the law of Moses; and to walk according to the statutes and ordinances, which he delivered to them from the Lord. This, then, was the baptism *unto Moses*. The solemn obligations which they were there brought under, in consequence of this miraculous deliverance, to recognize Moses as a prophet of the Lord, and to render obedience to his laws; just as in baptism we are brought under solemn obligations to obey and serve the Lord. When, however, the narrative expressly tells us that they went through the sea on dry ground, we know that there was no immersion in the case.

I Peter 3; 20, 21. "The long suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing, wherein few, that is, eight souls, were saved by water. The like figure whereunto, even baptism doth also now save us (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but

the answer of a good conscience toward God,) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ." Now, however our opponents may make use of these verses, for the purpose of establishing a connexion between water baptism and salvation, (which, by the way, they by no means do; for it is not any external purification, but an internal cleansing or purification that is connected with salvation: "Not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God.") We say, that, to whatever uses they may endeavour to put this passage, it is clear as noon day, that it can afford them no support for the practice of immersion. Noah and his family were not immersed. On the contrary, through the mercy of God, they were saved from that calamity, which beset all the rest of the ungodly world. There is no allusion whatever to the mode of baptism in this place, but to the effects of baptism; and that, not the external application of the water, but the internal purification of the Holy Spirit, producing the answer of a good conscience toward God. If our opponents will have an allusion to their mode of baptism in this passage, they can only find it in the fate of the ungodly world. They were properly immersed; and if our Baptist friends will

carry out the similitude, and make the allusion good, they ought to immerse only; for immersion does not signify putting an object under water, and picking it up again, but simply, putting it under water. If, then, when they put an individual under water, they were to let him go and leave him to his fate, they would just come up to the meaning of their own favorite term immersion; and they would, in many cases, have an apt resemblance to the only allusion which they can find in these verses.

Rom. 6; 3—5. “Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized unto his death? Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death; that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life. For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection.”

The general idea contained in these verses, is very plain; though it may require some little circumlocution, to divest it of the improper glosses that have been put upon it, and show the connexion of the several parts, with the one general idea contained in the whole.

Our opponents maintain, that, in the use of

the word buried here, and in the kindred passage in Col. 2; 12, there is a plain allusion to the mode of administering baptism by immersion. That as Christ was buried and rose again, so, in baptism, the individual is buried under the water, and rises again; aptly resembling both the burial and the resurrection of Christ.

1. In the first place, then, we remark, that, if we grant them an allusion here, it is an allusion that entirely fails in the object intended. The mode of baptizing by immersion, contains no similitude or resemblance to the burial of Christ whatever. Our Baptist friends seem to entertain the idea, and their language on this subject is calculated to impress the idea upon others, that Christ was buried in the same manner in which we are accustomed to bury the dead, by covering them in the earth. And it is only to a burial of this kind, that the practice of immersion can be pretended to have any resemblance. But this was not the nature of Christ's burial at all. He was not *buried* in the sense in which we are accustomed to use that word. He was laid in a sepulchre hewn out of the rock, as was "the Jews manner to bury."

The Jews' mode of burying, as also that of the Egyptians, and other eastern nations, was, to

lay the dead in sepulchres hewn out of the rock. Those sepulchres or tombs, were generally in the side of a hill or rocky precipice, into which persons could enter on a level from without, or with very little descent. In these, the dead were placed on benches or shelves hewn out of the rock, without any covering of earth, or any thing else, put over them, except the coffin in which they were enclosed. When this was done, the door was shut up, generally by a stone fitted for the purpose, until it was necessary to open it for the admission of another corpse, which was disposed of in a similar manner. This was the manner in which Lazarus was buried; and hence, when commanded by Christ to come forth, he did not rise up out of the grave, throwing off the earth with which he had been covered; but came walking out of the sepulchre, in which he had been laid.

Well, this was the manner in which Christ was buried. Mark 15; 46. "And he bought fine linen, and took him down, and wrapped him in the linen, and laid him *in a sepulchre which was hewn out of a rock*, and rolled a stone unto the door of the sepulchre." 16; 2—5. "And very early in the morning, the first day of the week, they came unto the sepulchre at the rising of the

sun. And they said among themselves, who shall roll us away the stone from the door of the sepulchre? (And when they looked they saw that the stone was rolled away) for it was very great. And entering into the sepulchre, they saw a young man sitting on the right side, clothed in a long white garment; and they were affrighted:" &c. Joseph having obtained the body, wrapped it in linen, and laid it in a sepulchre hewn out of a rock, and then rolled a stone to the door of the sepulchre. When Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James, and Salome, came with spices to embalm the body, they entered, all three, into the sepulchre; where they saw also a young man sitting, who invited them to behold the place where the Lord had lain.—But it is manifest that nothing of all this could have taken place in a grave—had Christ been buried, in any thing like the manner in which the dead are accustomed to be buried by us. The immersion of an individual in water, can bear no more resemblance to the burial of the Saviour, than it does to the piling away of goods on a merchant's shelves. There can be no allusion in this passage to the practice of immersion; for there is no kind of resemblance, between the immersion of an individual, and the burial of Christ which it is supposed to represent.

2. In the second place; If there is supposed to be an allusion to the mode of baptism, in the expression, "buried with him by baptism," why is it not supposed, that there is an allusion to the mode of baptism, in the other figures which are here employed? We are said to be "baptized into his death," we are said to be "crucified with him," and we are said to be "planted in the likeness of his death." Why, then, not have some such ceremony connected with the administration of baptism, as will resemble the death and crucifixion of Christ? for we are said to be baptized into his death. Some denominations use the sign of the cross in baptism, and if it is intended by that, to represent the death of Christ into which we are here said to be baptized, the similitude is better, and the authority for using it stronger, than the authority derived from this passage for the practice of immersion: for it contains no similitude to the burial of Christ whatever. In the fifth verse, we are said to be "planted together in the likeness of his death;" and this any one can perceive has reference to the same thing mentioned in the third verse, viz: being "baptized into his death." Why then, not also, have some such ceremony connected with baptism, as will represent planting? for being

"baptized into his death," in the third verse, is here called, being "planted in the likeness of his death." There is manifestly great room for improvement in our opponents' method of administering the ordinance, if they would carry out the subject of allusions with which they have commenced. And certainly no one can show, why we should have an allusion to the mode of baptism in one of these figures and not in the other.

3. But in the third place, if there is an allusion here at all, it is not to the *mode* but to the *effects* of baptism; or rather, we should say (for the word allusion is too faint) it is a description of the effects or results of baptism.

The apostle, in the preceding chapter, had just been speaking of salvation by grace, through faith in the Lord Jesus Christ; and at the commencement of this, he anticipates an objection to the doctrine; viz: that if we are to be saved thus, then, we had better continue in sin, that grace may be the more exalted in our salvation. "What shall we say then? shall we continue in sin that grace may abound?" From this he recoils with horror. "God forbid." And almost the whole of the chapter, is a refutation of this objection, which some might raise against, or

this consequence, which some might draw from, his doctrine.

This object of the apostle is necessary to be borne mind, in order to the proper understanding of all that succeeds to the end of the chapter. He is combating the objection, "Let us continue in sin that grace may abound," i. e. let us go on in sin that in proportion to the greatness of our sins, in the same proportion may the grace of God be exalted in our salvation. In reply to this he asks; "How shall we that are dead to sin live any longer therein?" If a man is dead, his life is at an end; and if a man be dead to sin, his life of sin is at an end. But all those who are saved by grace, are dead to sin, and alive unto God, through Jesus Christ our Lord. It is an absurdity then to suppose, that those who are saved by grace, should ever make such an abuse of it, as to continue in sin.

But he proceeds to show that all such, are dead to sin, in consequence of their union to the Lord Jesus Christ—that union which is instrumentally affected by baptism. "Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death," &c.—Here, baptism is represented as instrumentally

uniting us to Christ in three respects—in his death, in his burial, and in his resurrection. We are said to be “baptized into Christ.” Well, what is it to be baptized into Christ? It is to be baptized, in order to be united and conformed to Christ. This was the end and object of our baptism, and to this we were brought under the strongest possible obligations in baptism. All then who have been baptized into Christ, were baptized in order to be conformed to Christ, and to be conformed to him in these three respects—In his death: “So many of us as were baptized into Christ were baptized into his death.” In his burial; “Buried with him by baptism into death.” And in his resurrection; “That like as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father even so we also should walk in newness of life.” “For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection.”

They that are baptized into Christ, then, are baptized in order to be conformed to him, in his death, in his burial, and in his resurrection.—Well, in what does a conformity to Christ in his death consist? It consists in renouncing and forsaking sin; figuratively called in scripture being dead to sin: “That as Christ died unto sin

once, so we should reckon ourselves dead indeed unto sin, and alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord.”* Forsaking, abandoning and ceasing from the practise of sin, is being dead to sin, or conformed to Christ in his death. Well, to be buried with Christ, or to be conformed to Christ in his burial, is just, as it were, to be a step further removed, from the love and practice of sin. As the individual who is naturally dead, is freed from all the things of this world, so the individual who is dead to sin, has ceased from the love and practice of sin; And as the individual who has been buried, may be considered as one step further removed from all the cares and concerns of this life; so we are required so completely to abandon the love and practice of sin, as that we may be considered as dead and buried with respect to it. Thus it is we will be conformed to Christ in his death and burial. And to be conformed to Christ in his resurrection is to live a new life—a life of spirituality and holiness.—As an individual rising from the dead lives a new life, and as Christ having arisen from the dead lived a new life, so we are required to live a new life—a life of faith, and love, and obedi-

*Rom. 6; 10, 11.

ence. "That like as Christ was raised up from the dead, by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life." This then is that conformity to Christ in his death, burial, and resurrection, into which we are brought by baptism.

But we must beware of supposing, that, an internal union to Christ, and real conformity to him, will be efficiently accomplished by the external rite of baptism. For, as baptism is of two kinds, the baptism of the Holy Ghost, and the baptism of water; so conformity to Christ, is of two kinds, internal or spiritual and external or formal. The individual who is baptized with the Holy Ghost, for, "by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body,"* is really united to, and conformed to Christ, in all these respects. And the individual who receives the external rite of baptism, is externally, and formally, united to the Lord Jesus Christ, in as much as he is thus connected with the visible church of Christ, and brought under solemn obligations to be conformed to Christ, in his death, burial and resurrection. Both these kinds of conformity to Christ, may or they may not, be found in the same individual;

* 1 Cor. 12; 13.

but wherever the one exists we are bound in charity to suppose that the other exists also, unless we have good reason to believethethe contrary

By this exposition of the passage, you can see how fully it answers the object of the apostle, in refuting the objection; "Let us continue in sin that grace may abound." "How, says he, shall we that are dead to sin, live any longer therein?" But they that are Christ's are dead to sin, for by their baptism they have come under the most solemn obligations to be conformed to Christ, in his burial, and resurrection: that is, to be dead to sin, as one who is naturally dead, is dead to all the things of this world; and to be alive to holiness, as one that is alive from the dead. This is what every one who has been baptized into Christ, is under solemn obligations to be; and what every one who has been baptized by the Holy Ghost, in reality is. It is the effects or results of Baptism then that are here described, without any reference whatever to the mode of its administration.

Once more; let us put the question in this form; How are we buried with Christ? or how do we become conformed to Christ in his burial? The answer is found in the verse itself. It is by "baptism into death," "Therefore we are buri-

ed with him by baptism into death ; ” for the words ‘into death’ must be read in connexion with baptism, and not with death. We might be dead unto burying, but could not be said to be buried into death. The words “into death” then, must be read in connexion with baptism; and the passage thus read, expresses the idea, that it is by a “baptism into death,” that we are buried with Christ, or conformed to him in his burial. In the third verse it is said that “as many of us as were baptized into Christ, were baptized *into his death*,” and here we are told that it is by this baptism into death, that we are buried with him; “Buried with him by *baptism into death*.” If then we know what it is to be *baptized into Christ’s death*, we know the means by which we become buried with him. But to be baptized into Christ’s death, is just to be baptized in order to be conformed to Christ in his death. That “As he died unto sin once so we should reckon ourselves dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord.” And the individual who has been baptized with the Holy Ghost, has really become dead to sin; “That he should no longer live the rest of his time in the flesh to the lusts of men, but to the will of God.”*

*I Peter 4; 2.

It is the individual, then, who is conformed to Christ in his death, that as Christ died *for* sin, so he should be dead *to* sin—the individual who has renounced and abandoned the love and practice of sin, who is buried with Christ; and not the individual who has been put under the water. A man may be immersed five hundred times, and if he has not become dead to sin, and alive to holiness; he has never yet been buried with Christ. On the contrary if he is dying unto sin, and living unto holiness—if he is shunning sin and practising holiness in the fear of God—If he is denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, and living soberly, righteously, and godly, in this present world, he is buried with Christ in the sense in which the apostle uses that expression, whether he has ever been put under the water or not.

John 3; 5. “Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.” This is another of the texts of scripture on which considerable stress is laid, as favouring the practice of immersion. “Born of water,” is a phrase, which our Baptist friends, consider as being used in allusion to immersion, because of some fancied resemblance which they think they can trace, between an individual rising out of the water after immersion, and the

manner in which a child is born into the world. We must acknowledge that they are exceedingly good at tracing resemblances; and this resemblance we must allow them to retain; for the time, and place, and subject, are all too sacred, to allow of exposing it as it deserves.

We remark however, first; That, though the expressions "born of God," and "born of the Spirit," are frequently used in the word of God, this expression 'born of water,' is now here used but in this single instance. And while it is admitted that one plain direct text of scripture will prove a doctrine as well twenty, yet, it must also be acknowledged, that we are in much greater danger of mistaking the meaning of an expression, that is used but once, then if it were frequently employed, in different places, and under different circumstances.

But, second; If there is supposed to be, in the expression "born of water," an allusion to the mode in which water is used in baptism; there is just as good reason to suppose, that in the expression, "born of the Spirit," there is an allusion to the manner in which the Spirit performs his work. If there is a resemblance between the mode of baptism, and the manner in which a man is born into the world; there must likewise

be a resemblance, between the manner in which the Spirit performs his operation, and the manner in which a man is born into the world. But this we think will not be pretended by any. Nay, we are expressly given to understand by Christ himself, that we can know nothing about the mode in which the Spirit performs his work; for, says he, "The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth; so is every one that is born of the Spirit."* It is not to the mode in which the Spirit performs his work that there is any allusion in the expression "born of the Spirit," but to the effect that is produced. For as birth is the commencement of natural life in the world, so the renovation of the Holy Spirit, is the beginning of a new life of spirituality and holiness in the soul. And it is because the individual who has experienced the renovating power of the Holy Spirit lives afterwards a new life, that he is said to have been born of the Spirit. As this is manifestly the sense in which the expression "born of the Spirit" is used, the allusion being not to the mode, but to the effect of his operation; it is also

*John 3; 8.

doubtless the sense in which the expression “born of water” is used; for they are both employed in the same manner, in the same sentence. And the allusion here again, just as in the two former cases, is not to the mode, but to the effects of baptism. As the individual who experiences the renovating power of the Holy Spirit, enters really upon a new life of spirituality and holiness, and is therefore said to be “born of the Spirit;” so he who is baptized, by profession and by solemn covenant obligation, undertakes to live a new life, and hence is said to be “born of water.” By the renovation of the Holy Spirit, he enters into the real and invisible kingdom of Christ; and by baptism, he enters into the outward or visible kingdom of the Saviour. Hence, he may be said to be born of the water, and of the Spirit; but in both expressions, it is the effect, and not the mode, to which there is any reference.

Rom. 6; 17. “But God be thanked, that ye were the servants of sin; but ye have obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine which was delivered you.” This is the only remaining passage, to which we shall direct your attention on this part of the subject. “The form of doctrine here mentioned,” it is said, “means immersion;

because that in immersion, there is a representation of the death, burial, and resurrection, of Christ, the cardinal doctrines of the bible.” We think however, that it must be manifest to all who will reflect but a moment upon the manner of Christ’s death, and burial, and resurrection, that there is not in immersion, the smallest resemblance to any of the three. The manner of Christ’s death was crucifixion. He was in his death, “lifted up,”* so as to draw all men unto him; and not put down, as in the practice of immersion. The manner of his burial, was being laid in a sepulchre hewn out of the rock; and the manner of his resurrection, was to come forth out of that sepulchre, when its door was opened by the angel rolling away the stone.

However, it is said, that the ‘form of doctrine,’ means immersion; or, if you will, baptism administered by immersion. Of course, then, the meaning of the verse is this; “But God be thanked that ye were the servants of sin, but now ye have been immersed from the heart.” We must say, that this is one of the most extraordinary interpretations of scripture we have ever seen. It is almost equal to the interpretation of a prea-

*John 3; 14, 15. and 12; 32.

cher, of whom the celebrated Robert Hall tells us, who interpreted the language of Christ to Peter, "Before the cock crow, thou shalt deny me thrice;" to be a command to Peter to deny the Saviour. "Thou *shalt* deny me thrice," and hence Peter in denying his Lord, was only following his Lord's own directions, for his personal safety. Those who make such a use of the word of God, ought to study well the concluding verses of the sacred volume.

The form of doctrine here mentioned, is the same as the form of sound words, mentioned in 2 Tim. 1; 13. "Hold fast the form of sound words, which thou hast heard of me in faith and love which is in Christ Jesus." It is the rule or system of doctrine which they had received; and the meaning of the whole is, "God be thanked, that, though ye were the servants of sin, ye are now the servants of God, having obeyed from the heart, that rule or system of doctrine which is contained in his word."

Thus we have examined the principal arguments from scripture on which our opponents rely for sustaining their cause. First, The meaning of the word *bapto* and *baptidzo*, considered in our first discourse. Second, The places at which baptism was administered, considered in

our second, and Third, 'The figurative language, or allusions to baptism, which we have now considered. There is some other figurative language used in reference to the ordinance, but as it is mostly of a different character, we shall defer the consideration of it, until we come to speak of a different mode of administering the ordinance.

There are, however, some arguments of rather a different kind made use of by our opponents, to which we shall now briefly turn your attention.

I. It is said, that, "A good way of testing whether immersion or sprinkling, be the meaning of baptism, is to substitute those words for baptism, and see which will make the best sense." To substitute the definition for the term, it is said, is always a good rule of interpretation.— And hence, the experiment is made in Luke 12; 50. "I have a baptism to be baptized with, and how am I straitened till it be accomplished?"— Now, it is said, substitute immersion for baptism here, and we will have a good sense. "I have an *immersion* to *immersed* with; and how am I straitened until it be accomplished?" That is, Christ was about to be immersed or overwhelmed in sorrow. But substitute sprinkling, and see how

it will read. “I have a *sprinkling* to be *sprinkled* with; and how am I straitened till it be accomplished?”

We think our opponents must admit that we have presented this argument in its full force. But though it is at first sight somewhat plausible, and calculated to deceive the unwary, we think we can show that it will not bear examination.

First. We remark; that it is a good test, of the correctness of any definition, to substitute the definition for the term, when both the definition and the term, are used in the literal, or in the same sense. For example, we may say; “we breath the vital air.” What is the definition of breath, here? It is inhale. Of vital? life sustaining. Of air? atmosphere. Well, it will do to substitute all these definitions for the terms, and say, “We inhale the life-sustaining atmosphere,” because both the definitions and the terms, are used in their natural and literal sense. But the substitution of a definition for a term, is not a good rule of interpretation, when words are used figuratively, or only by way of accommodation. For example; what is the definition of the word volume? We all know the signification in which it is commonly used; but what is its original and radical definition? It is

roll, from the Latin word *volvo*, to roll; because books anciently consisted of skins of parchment, mounted on rollers, much in the same manner as maps of the present day. But even after books began to assume a different shape still the original name volume was retained. Now, though it will do very well to say, "I have so many volumes, in my library;" it will not do to substitute the definition for the term, and say; "I have so many rolls in my library"; for there are none there at all.

We frequently speak of the sacrament sabbath. Well, the definition of sacrament is, oath; and of sabbath, rest. Now it would look rather ridiculous, to substitute the definitions for the terms in this place, and instead of saying, "It is yet three weeks to our next sacrament sabbath," say "It is yet three weeks to our next *oath rest*." Supper signifies, an evening meal; but it would not be a very dignified mode of speaking, to say the least of it, to substitute the definition for the term, and instead of speaking of the Lord's supper, speak always of the Lord's *evening meal*. Because in all these and similar instances, the words are used figuratively, or only by way of accommodation.

Further, Christ says; "I have a baptism to be

baptized with." Well what is the meaning of the word baptism, as commonly used by our opponents themselves? Is it simply immersion? Certainly not. If simple immersion be baptism, then Jonah was baptized; then any mischievous boy, who trips up the heels of another, and tosses him into the creek baptizes him. If simple immersion be baptism, then I have been baptized a hundred times, and probably you all have, and we are all as good Baptists as they. It is manifest then that simple immersion is not the sense in which they themselves use the word baptism. It is immersion in a solemn manner, by a properly qualified person, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. This is their own definition of baptism, as their conduct manifestly shows. Well, substitute this definition for the term, in the language of Christ, and see whether it will not be as far from the meaning of the Saviour, as, "I have a sprinkling to be sprinkled with."

It is only by a dexterous trick of Legerde-main, that this kind of argument can be imposed upon the people; adroitly changing the subject before their eyes, without their perceiving that any change has been effected.

Further still, There is another flaw in this ar-

gument. It is this; that in the substituting of the definition for the term, in the language of Christ, and saying in the one case, "I have an immersion to be immersed with;" and in the other, "I have a sprinkling to be sprinkled with;" neither is their correct translation, nor our correct translation of the term made use of. To sprinkle, is not our translation of the word *baptidzo* as used in the scriptures, but, as we have already fully shown, it is to wash or cleanse.— And the translation of the word according to the sense which they attach to it, is not to immerse; for immerse is not an English translation of the word at all. It is merely the substitution of a Latin word for a Greek one. Baptize is a Greek word, not translated, but adopted, into our language; and immerse is a Latin word, not translated into our language, but adopted. It is no translation at all to substitute a word of one dead language for a word of another dead language. The word immersion then is a word to which they have no right or title whatever.— They tell us that we do not translate the original term when we use the word baptize, and yet they themselves only give us a Latin word in its stead. As they seem afraid however, to come into the English language to find a word that will express

the idea which they attach to the word *baptidzo*, we must try whether we cannot find one for them. Well, all we can find is, “to duck.”—Nay be not surprised, for if there is any thing ridiculous here, it is either in the idea which they attach to the word; or it is in the poverty of the English language to express that idea; for there is no other word of good Saxon English, that expresses the idea which they practically attach to *baptidzo*, than “to duck.” To dip, will not do it; for an object may be dipped in water, and yet be very far from being covered with it. To plunge, will not do it; for an object may be plunged in water, and yet be far from being put entirely under it. But, to duck, just signifies to plunge over head and ears. This is the literal English translation, according to their meaning, of the word *baptidzo*. Now substitute this definition of the word for the word itself, in the passage referred to, and see whether it will present a much more dignified meaning than sprinkling. “I have a *ducking* to be *ducked* with; and how am I straitened till it be accomplished!”

Christ was about to suffer the punishment due to our sins. He was about to take our room and place, and bear in our stead, that wrath which must otherwise have come upon us to the uttermost.—

And how is the punishment of sinners represented as coming upon them? It is as coming down or being poured out upon them. The Lord pours out his fury; he pours out his indignation; he pours out his wrath.* It was in reference to this—to the wrath of God which was about to be poured upon him as our substitute, that he used the language; “I have a baptism to be baptized with; and how am I straitened until it be accomplished.” It is a passage of too much importance, and awful solemnity, to be used in such experimenting; and nothing could have induced us to notice it, as we have done, but an earnest desire to disabuse the minds of men, of the erroneous impressions, which may have been made by this mode of argument.

II. Another mode of argumentation, to which no small importance is attached by some of our Baptist friends, is, the following. “All the world admit, that immersion is a proper mode of baptism; but all the world do not admit, that sprinkling is a proper mode of baptism; hence it is safest to adhere to that mode which all admit will answer the purpose.” And it is illustrated by saying, that if it were a matter of dollars

*Jer. 10; 25. Ezek. 7; 8. Ps. 69; 24. Ezek. 21; 31. Ps. 79; 6. Rev. 16; 1.

and cents, it would soon be settled. As, for example; if I were to present to my friend in payment of a debt, two notes of the same denomination, but on different banks; and tell him, that one of these was considered good by a great many persons, but there were many also who considered it bad; but the other was admitted by all to be good—no one doubted it; would he have any difficulty in making his selection—would he not make choice of that which all considered good?

Now this is really so silly an argument that were it not lest, perhaps, some may have been deceived by it, we should never think worth while to look at it.

“All the world admit, that immersion is a proper mode of baptism; but all the world do not admit, that sprinkling is a proper mode of baptism; hence it is safest to be immersed.” This is the very argument by which the Roman Catholic proves, that it is better to be a Catholic, than a Protestant. Both Catholics and Protestants, say they, admit, that a man *may* be saved in the Catholic church; but both Catholics and Protestants do not admit, that a man *can* be saved in the Protestant church. Hence it is safer to be in the Catholic church, where all admit there

is a possibility of salvation, than to be in the Protestant church, where many (all good Catholics) do not admit that there is any possibility of salvation. This is the very same argument, and if it is good in the one case, it is good in the other; and our opponents, on their own principles, ought to return back immediately, to the bosom of "Mother church."

If questions of this kind were to be decided by the mere force of public opinion, we admit, that the argument would be good; but if they are to be settled on their own intrinsic merits, the mere popularity of the one side or the other, will not way a single feather in the scale. It is not by popular opinion, that questions of duty to God are to be decided; but by the word of God himself. And on the individual who has ascertained his duty from God's own word, the mere popularity, or unpopularity of the duty, will have no effect whatever.

Well but, it is said, you yourselves admit that the first mode will do. True: we admit that the mere mode of applying the water, is not so essential to the ordinance, as to render it null and void, unless it has been applied in one particular manner. But while we admit, that baptism performed in the first manner, if performed by a

regular minister, of any acknowledged branch of the christian church, in the name of the Holy Trinity, is so far valid, as not to render it necessary to be repeated; yet we know from God's own word, that baptism administered in the second mode, is more suitable, significant, and scriptural. And all the opposition that may be made to it, and all the popular opinion that may be raised against it, will not have the smallest influence in removing us from our position, standing as we do, on the broad foundation of God's eternal truth.

The illustration by which they attempt to sustain their point, is one of the best that we could make choice of to sustain ours; and therefore we shall make use of it, as they have furnished it to our hand. It is said, if this were a matter of dollars and cents, it would soon be settled.— An individual would soon make choice of that note which no body disputed, in preference to one that many questioned. Well, this would be the case, if the individual knew nothing of the kind of money he was receiving; and had no other way of determining its quality, than by popular opinion. Such would also be the case if we had no knowledge ourselves of our duty to God, nor any other way of ascertaining our duty, than by

popular breath; so that this argument is only an argument directed to the ignorance of men.

But let us stick to the illustration for a moment. Here are two banks, call the one the first, and the other the second bank if you please. I am well acquainted with both. I know the state and condition of their affairs, and the men who have the chief management of their concerns. And while I am willing to receive the notes of either bank, knowing that either will answer my purpose, and pass current; yet I know that the first bank has the largest capital, has the most substantial men—the ablest financiers—and men of the most moral worth and integrity at the head of its affairs, and that in all its management, it has been kept fairly within the bounds of the fundamental law—the charter of the institution. Hence while I am willing to receive the notes of either bank, I greatly prefer those of the first. And though some interested individuals, may, for selfish or other ends endeavour to raise a bad report on the first bank, and may so far succeed in prejudicing the minds of many against it, as that, it may in truth be said, that every body believes the second bank to be good, but every body does not believe the first to be so; yet this does not effect my opinion of

it in the least; for, from my own knowledge of its officers, its management, and situation, I consider it incomparably the better bank of the two. Nor will all the prejudice which a few individuals may have succeeded in raising against it, shake my confidence in the least, in that institution, which I know to be in a healthy state, and to be so far preferable to the other in every respect. The application of this to the case in hand is easy. I know from God's own word, that pouring or sprinkling, is the most significant and scriptural mode, of administering the ordinance of baptism; and while I admit that another mode *may* answer the purpose, I know from God's own word, that this is in every respect the preferable mode of its administration. And, hence, all the prejudice, or popular opinion, which those who practise a different mode, may succeed in raising against it, will not in the smallest degree alter my opinion on the subject.

This argument, then, is one that is directed to the ignorance of men, and can only have influence with the ignorant; but can have no influence at all, upon those who think and judge for themselves.

III. Another mode of argumentation, is the following. "All men wish to get to heaven in the

cheapest and easiest way; and hence a change from immersion to sprinkling, is easily accounted for; but not so easily a change from sprinkling to immersion!" And we are told of a bishop somebody in Kentucky, who became so fully convinced that immersion was the only correct mode of baptism, that he went all the way to Greece, to get immersed by a Grecian bishop. "The way he became convinced on the subject was this: he was a good logician, and reasoned, that, if sprinkling had been the original mode of administering the ordinance, we cannot account for its being changed to immersion; whereas had immersion been the original mode, a change to sprinkling is easily accounted for, on the principle, that men always wish to get to heaven in the cheapest and easiest way."

The individual who reasons thus, may be a very good logician, but he must be a very poor observer of men and things. He must be very poorly acquainted with human nature, and with the history of the human race. It is contrary to the nature of the depraved heart of man, and contrary to the history of the whole human family, to say, that men always wish to get to heaven, in the cheapest and easiest way, so far as external rites and ceremonies are concerned.—

Men have, in all ages, been prone to attach a superstitious importance to external rites and ceremonies; and to these too; just in proportion to their difficulty and expensiveness. The Judaizing teachers of old did not manifest much desire to get to heaven in the cheapest and easiest way when they were bent on introducing circumcision, and obedience to all the requisitions of the Mosaic law, into the christian church: and so persevering were they in their efforts, that the apostle had earnestly and solemnly to warn the churchs, against those who came in privily to spy out their liberty, and bring them again under the yoke of bondage. The Christian religion presented too cheap and easy a way of getting to heaven, and all its ordinances were too simple and spiritual for such teachers. The Mahometans do not seek the cheapest and easiest way of getting to heaven, when they will spend all their substance, and risk their lives to boot, to make a meritorious pilgrimage to Mecca. The poor deluded Roman Catholic, does not seek the cheapest and easiest way of getting to heaven, when he will pay his last cent to the priest, make any sacrifice, and suffer any punishment or penance that may be imposed upon him, in order to obtain his salvation; ra-

ther than simply repent of his sins and believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, as the Protestant teaches him.

Any thing is more agreeable to the natural mind, than that deep humility and contrition of heart, which God requires on account of sin; that entire emptying one's self of all merit, and trusting for salvation solely to the merits of another; and that holiness of heart and soul, as well as uprightness of conduct, which are peremptorily required by the word of God. Hence, wherever there is any external rite, to which much importance is attached, or which has any thing of the nature of merit connected with it, no matter how expensive it may be, or how difficult of performance, men will grasp at it, as something that will help them on to heaven; while they shrink from the humility, and dependance, and holiness, required by the gospel.

If there is any desire in men to get to heaven in the cheapest and easiest way, it is to get to heaven without deep repentance and contrition of heart, without faith solely in the merits of another for salvation, and without that purity and holiness, which are necessary to see God's face in mercy. There has never been any natural disposition manifested by men, to get to heaven

in the cheapest and easiest way, so far as external rites and ceremonies are concerned; but the very contrary. And if there is any thing past another which ought to render us suspicious of the mode of administering baptism by immersion, it is the superstitious importance that is attached to it, and the eagerness with which many who give no visible evidence of repentance, and faith, and love, grasp at it, as a principal means of raising them to the happiness of heaven.

IV. History is also claimed by our opponents in favour of their cause. And it is admitted, that the practice of immersion was early introduced into the christian church, when men began to attach a superstitious importance to the quantity of water used, and to something like a literal cleansing of the body as more significant of a cleansing from sin. But the very same history which gives an account of baptism performed by immersion, also gives an account of baptism performed by pouring or sprinkling, coming down side by side with immersion wherever it was practised. An appeal to history then defeats their own cause; for, let it be remembered, that their position is not that immersion is the preferable mode of baptism, but that it is the only mode, and that nothing else is baptism at all,

They appeal to the practice of the ancient church in proof of this, and yet we find the ancient church using both immersion and sprinkling as proper and valid modes of administering this ordinance.

But the same histories which give an account of immersion being used in the ancient church, also inform us, that when baptism was administered in this manner it was administered naked.

Dr. Miller, (than whom few men are better acquainted with Ecclesiastical history,) states, "That there is no historical fact more perfectly established, than that, whenever baptism was thus administered, the candidate, whether infant or adult, male or female, was *entirely divested of all clothing*; not merely of outer garments, but, I repeat it, of *all clothing*."* Wall, also in his history of baptism, says; "The ancient Christians, when they were baptized by immersion, were all baptized naked; whether they were men, women, or children. The proofs of this I shall omit, because it is a clear case:—They thought it better represented the putting off the old man, and also the nakedness of Christ on the cross. Moreover, as baptism is a washing, they judged it should be a washing of the body,

*Miller on Bap., page 83.

not of the clothes."† And the zealous Baptist Robinson, says on this same subject; "The primitive Christians baptized naked. Nothing is easier than to give proof of this by quotations from the authentic writings of the men who administered baptism, and who certainly knew in what way they themselves performed it. There is no ancient historical fact better authenticated than this. The evidence doth not go on the meaning of the single word naked; for then a reader might suspect allegory; but on many facts reported, and many reasons assigned for the practice."*

An appeal to history then, will not benefit the cause of our opponents; for the same history to which they appeal, establishes the fact, that sprinkling was also practised as a valid mode of baptism: and also establishes the additional fact, that those to whom they appeal in support of their cause, administered baptism in a different manner from them. Many of our Baptist friends believe, that this (immersing naked) was the mode of administering baptism by John the Baptist, and in the Apostolic church. Such seems to be the opinion of Robinson himself on the subject; for he speaks of many ancient pic-

†Wall, Chap. XV. P. II.

*Robinson's His. of Bap. page 94.

tures and statues, which represent persons being immersed in this manner: and among other Christ as being thus immersed by John the Baptist.

Why then do our opponents differ so far in their mode of administering this ordinance, from that ancient church to which they appeal in support of their practice; and from what they believe to be the mode in which it was originally administered? It will not do for *them* to say that they *essentially* follow the same practice; for their uniform doctrine in reference to positive institutions, is, that they must be complied with to the very letter, in every particular; and they often ridicule the idea of our using the words, essentially, or for substance, in reference to this subject. An appeal to history then confutes themselves, both in their exclusive claims with regard to immersion, and in their mode of performing it.

We have thus examined every argument which we have seen, that is worthy of notice, in favour of immersion being the only valid mode of administering this ordinance, and found them utterly incapable of sustaining the position.— We might now then consider our work finished, but that it may be the more complete, we shall direct your attention in yet another discourse, to

the mode of administering baptism by pouring or sprinkling; showing its scriptural, and significant nature, and its preference in every respect to immersion.

DISCOURSE IV.

Acts 11; 15, 16. "And as I began to speak, the Holy Ghost fell on them, as on us at the beginning. Then remembered I the word of the Lord, how that he said, John indeed baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost."

Having in three preceding discourses, directed your attention to an examination of the various arguments, by which it is maintained, that immersion is the only valid and scriptural mode of administering the ordinance of baptism, and found them utterly incapable of sustaining the position. We shall now call your attention to a different mode of administering the ordinance, viz: by pouring or sprinkling; and show that this is the more significant and scriptural, and in every way the preferable mode of administration.

We class pouring and sprinkling together, because they are both of the same nature, and are both very expressive of the thing signified by it; which immersion is not. If we admit, as we do, that the application of water in any mode, commonly practised by any branch of the christian church, according to the rules of that church, contains all that is essential to the ordinance, so as not to render it necessary to be repeated;

much more do we admit, that the ordinance is essentially and properly performed, when it is applied in either of the two modes last mentioned. We have no objection that the administrator of this ordinance, pour the water from his hand, or out of a convenient vessel, or sprinkle it with his fingers; and indeed the two modes are so similar, that it is often difficult to tell whether it has been poured from the hand, or sprinkled from the fingers. Nor do we know that those who prefer either manner, have ever laid claim to the possession of the only valid mode of administration. Nay, though we thus speak of them as two, for distinction sake, they are essentially one and the same.

Pouring or sprinkling, then, is that which we consider the most significant, scriptural, and proper mode of administering the ordinance; and that it is so, we shall now endeavour to show.

I. What then, we enquire, in the first place, is the use of water in this ordinance representative or symbolical of? what is it intended to prefigure or represent? There are some who call themselves by the name of Baptists, but who scarcely deserve the name, who seem to entertain the idea that it is not representative of any thing. We say, *seem to entertain the idea*.

for it is very difficult to get at a proper understanding of their real sentiments on the subject. They seem to entertain the idea that it is not *symbolical* of any thing, but *effectual* for a most important purpose; and that purpose is a cleansing from sin. They seem to hold something like the Roman Catholic doctrine of *opus operatum* on the subject; that is, that there is an inherent intrinsic efficacy in the ordinance itself, to accomplish the purpose intended: and I have known of some who would point to a certain creek, not a hundred miles from this, and say, that there was enough of water there, to wash away all the sins of all the inhabitants of the United States.

Not to speak of the absurdity of supposing that any external application to the body, could effect the internal state of the soul; we might ask how it accords with facts. Does the history of those who have been put under the water confirm the truth of this opinion? On the contrary, do we not see many of those who have been the subjects of this ordinance, give abundant evidence that they have derived no such advantage from it?

The bible tells us, that, "except men repent

they shall all likewise perish:"* an individual might have been immersed by the apostle Paul then, and yet without repentance he would experience no forgiveness. The bible tells us, that, "without faith it is impossible to please God;" and that, "he that believeth not shall be damned:"† a man might be immersed five hundred times then, and yet if he is not possessed of faith in Christ—if he does not receive and trust to him alone for salvation, he will still lie under the accumulated load of his guilt. The bible tells us, that, "without holiness no man shall see the Lord" and that, "neither circumcision availleth any thing, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature:"‡ if a man is not renewed by the Holy Ghost then, and does not live a holy life, "denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world," he may be immersed every day of his life, and after all, go down to hell with a lie in his right-hand, and with all his sins upon his head.

Those, however, of our Baptist brethren, who take a different view of the subject, admit with us, that the use of water in this ordinance is representative or symbolical of the cleansing

*Luke 13; 3, 5. †Heb. 11; 6. Mark 16; 16.

‡Heb. 12; 14. Gal. 6; 15.

influence of God's Holy Spirit; especially in his application of the blood of atonement to the soul. And we shall endeavour to offer you some reasons for this opinion.

1st. The influence of the Holy Spirit upon the soul, and the application of water to the body, in this ordinance, are both called by the same name — baptism. Mark 1; 8. "I indeed have baptized you with water; but he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost." Christ himself speaking to his disciples says Acts 1; 5. "For John truly baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost, not many days hence." This promise of Christ was fulfilled on the day of Pentecost, when the Spirit was poured out upon the disciples; as is manifest from the apostle Peter's own account of it. When speaking of Cornelius and his friends, he says, Acts 11; 15. "And as I began to speak, the Holy Ghost fell on them, *as on us at the beginning*. Then remembered I the word of the Lord, how that he said, John indeed baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost." Those Gentiles had received the influences of the Holy Spirit, in the same manner as the disciples on the day of Pentecost, and in both cases it was a fulfilment of the words of Christ; "Ye shall be

baptized with the Holy Ghost." But lest it might be thought that this expression applies only to the miraculous influences of the Holy Spirit, we have the common influences of the Spirit called by the same name, in I. Cor. 12; 13. "For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body."

2d. Not only are the influences of the Holy Spirit upon the soul, and the application of water to the body, in this ordinance, called by the same name, but they are so, in the same connexion, and in the same manner. "I indeed have baptized you with water; but he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost." This form of expression occurs at least once in each of the gospels, and twice in the Acts; and any individual by examining either the original or the translation, will perceive that it is the same form or construction of language, that is used in both parts of the expression. And from the close and intimate connexion in which both parts of this expression are used, and their perfect similarity of construction, it is manifest that they are used as far as the nature of the subject will allow, in the same sense.

3d. It is manifest from the very form of this expression, "I indeed have baptized you with water; but he shall baptize you with the Holy

Ghost;" that the latter, is considered by far the more important of the two: and hence if there is any thing representative in either, it must be the less, that is representative of the greater.

4th. Water is the grand element of natural cleansing, and the Holy Spirit is the grand agent in spiritual cleansing. The same effect that water produces on the body, is the Holy Spirit represented as producing upon the soul. Thus we find David saying in the fifty-first psalm: "Wash me thoroughly from mine iniquity, and cleanse me from my sin.—Purge me with hyssop and I shall be clean; wash me, and I shall be whiter than the snow," and whom he recognizes as the agent in this work is manifest from his prayer in the eleventh verse, "Cast me not away from thy presence; and take not thy *Holy Spirit* from me." Tit. 3; 5. "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the *washing of regeneration* and *renewing of the Holy Ghost*."—II. Thes. 2; 13. "But we are bound to give thanks always to God for you, brethren, beloved of the Lord, because God hath from the beginning chosen you to salvation, through *sanctification of the Spirit*, and belief of the truth." I. Cor. 6; 11. "And such were some of you; but

ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified, in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God.”* I Peter 1; 22. Seeing ye have *purified* your souls in obeying the truth *through the Spirit.*” The effect of the Holy Spirit’s influence upon the soul, is in these and in similar passages of scripture represented to be of a cleansing, a washing, a sanctifying, a purifying influence. If this then be the effect of the Spirit’s influence upon the soul—if this be what it is to be baptized by the Holy Ghost; surely the application of water in this ordinance, is well calculated to represent or symbolize, the cleansing and sanctifying influence of God’s Holy Spirit.

The blood of Christ is the grand means made use of by the Holy Spirit in this cleansing.—I. John 1; 7. “But if we walk in the light, as he

*This verse is an example of the figure of speech called *Hyperbaton*, i. e. a transposition of the order of the words; and the meaning plainly is, “And such were some of you, but ye are washed, but ye are sanctified by the spirit of our God; but ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus.” An example of the same figure of speech we have also in Philem. 5; “Hearing of thy love and faith, which thou hast toward the Lord Jesus, and toward all saints.” That is; “Hearing of thy faith which thou hast toward the Lord Jesus, and of thy love which thou hast toward all saints.” Also, Gal. 6; 16,

is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin." Rev. 1; 5. "Unto him that loved us and washed us from our sins in his own blood." The influences of the Holy Spirit upon the soul, especially in the application of the blood of atonement, is that which is represented or signified by the use of water in this ordinance.

In our first discourse on this subject, we showed that the meaning of the word *baptidzo*, as used in the scriptures, is, to wash or cleanse; and here we find that that interpretation exactly agrees with the signification of the word, as used in connexion with the Holy Ghost; for the effect of his operation, is the renovation of the heart; the purifying and cleansing of the soul, by the application of the blood of atonement.

II. A second important inquiry then is; In what manner is the Holy Spirit represented as coming upon men? and in what manner is the blood of atonement represented as being applied to the soul? You will bear in mind that our first inquiry was; what is the use of water in this ordinance representative or symbolical of? We have just seen that it is representative or symbolical of the cleansing influence of the Holy

Spirit upon the soul. And hence our next inquiry is; In what manner is the Holy Spirit represented as coming upon man? or in what manner are we represented as being baptized with the Holy Ghost? This inquiry will lead us to consult an infallible Lexicon even the word of God itself—a lexicon of more worth and importance, than all the Greek and Latin dictionaries in existence.

We are said to be baptized with the Holy Ghost, “For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body.”* Nay we are said to be baptized with the Holy Ghost, in the same sentence, and in the same form and construction of language, in which we are said to be baptized with water. “John indeed baptized with water but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost.”† If then the bible tells us how the Holy Spirit comes upon men; we have God’s own explanation of the manner in which we are baptized with the Holy Ghost; and hence God’s own definition of the word *baptidzo*, as used in connexion with the Holy Ghost.

1st. The Spirit is said to be *poured out*. Prov. 1; 23. “Behold I *will pour out my Spirit* upon you, I will make known my words unto you.”—

* I Cor. 12; 13.

† Acts 11; 16.

Is. 44; 3. "*I will pour my Spirit upon thy seed, and my blessing upon thine offspring.*" Ezek. 39; 29. "For I have *poured out my Spirit* upon the house of Israel, saith the Lord God." Acts 2; 16, 17. "But this is that which was spoken by the prophet Joel; And it shall come to pass in the last days (saith God) I will *pour out of my Spirit* upon all flesh."

2d. The Spirit is said to be *shed forth*. Acts 2; 33. "Therefore being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, hath *shed forth* this which ye now see and hear." Titus 3; 6. "Which he *shed on us abundantly*," that is, the Holy Ghost mentioned in the preceding verse; "Which he *shed on us abundantly, through Jesus Christ our Saviour.*"

3d. The Holy Spirit is said to fall upon. Acts 10; 44. "While Peter yet spake these words, the *Holy Ghost fell* on all them that heard the word." 11; 15. "And as I began to speak, the *Holy Ghost fell* on them, as on us at the beginning." And this was baptism; for says the apostle in the following verse; "Then remembered I the word of the Lord, how that he said, John indeed baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost."

Here then we have the bible definition of the expression, “Baptized with the Holy Ghost.” It is to have the Holy Ghost *poured out*, or *shed forth*, or *fall upon* us. Indeed all these expressions are used in reference to one case of Baptism; viz: the descent of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost. The descent of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost was baptism, if we can believe the apostle Peter’s account of the matter. It was a fulfilment of the word of Christ; “Ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence.” But how were the disciples baptized with the Holy Ghost upon that occasion? It was by having the Holy Ghost *poured upon* them. “This is that which was spoken by the prophet Joel; And it shall come to pass in the last days (saith God) I will *pour out my Spirit* upon all flesh.” Or by having him *shed forth*. “And having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost hath *shed forth* this which ye now see and hear.” Or it was by him *falling upon* them. “As I began to speak the *Holy Ghost fell on them as on us at the beginning.*”

Now if this is the bible definition of the expression, “Baptized with the Holy Ghost,” ought we not naturally to conclude, that such would

also be the definition of the expression “Baptized with water,” seeing the two expressions are used in such close and intimate connexion? If to be baptized with the Holy Ghost, is to have the Holy Ghost poured out, or shed forth, or fall upon us; ought not the expression baptized with water, to mean to have the water poured out, or shed forth, or fall upon us? Thus God explains to us his own language, if men would only be content to follow his divine instructions.

Again. How is the blood of attonement represented as being applied to the soul; for this is the grand means made use of by the Spirit in cleansing us from all sin? It is represented as being by sprinkling. Heb. 12; 24. “And to Jesus the Mediator of the new covenant, and to the *blood of sprinkling* that speaketh better things than that of Abel.” I Peter 1; 2. “Elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and *sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ.*” The manner too in which the blood of atonement under the former dispensation, which was typical of the blood of Christ, was used, was by sprinkling. Heb. 9; 19—22. “For when Moses had spoken every precept to all the people according to the law, he took the blood of calves

and of goats, with water, and scarlet wool, and hyssop, and *sprinkled both the book and all the people*.—Moreover he *sprinkled* likewise with blood, both the tabernacle, and all the vessels of the ministry. And almost all things are by the law purged with blood; and without the shedding of blood is no remission.”

If then, (as all admit, who ascribe to the use of water in this ordinance any symbolical meaning whatever,) it symbolizes or represents the renovating, cleansing, and sanctifying, influences of the Holy Spirit upon the soul; we think it must be admitted, that pouring or sprinkling, is the most significant mode of applying the water for this purpose.

Pouring, symbolizes the manner in which the Holy Spirit comes upon men, producing his renovating and sanctifying effects; for he is poured out, or shed forth, or falls upon men. And this is baptism—God’s own definition of what it is to be baptized with the Holy Ghost. Well,

Sprinkling, is also a significant and scriptural mode of administering this ordinance; for, Sprinkling was one of God’s ancient and most prominently established modes of symbolical cleansing under the Old Testament dispensation. It is foretold in ancient prophecy to be one of God’s

modes of symbolical cleansing under the gospel. It symbolizes the mode of the Spirit's coming upon men; and also the manner in which he applies the blood of atonement to the soul.

Let us look for a little at each of these particulars.

1st. Sprinkling was one of God's prominent established modes of symbolical cleansing under the Old Testament dispensation. When we look into the Mosaic law, we find that sprinkling was one of the most common modes of symbolical cleansing. When an individual was to be cleansed from the leprosy, he was to be cleansed by sprinkling. Lev. 14; 7. "And he shall *sprinkle* upon him that is to be cleansed from the leprosy seven times, and shall pronounce him clean."—When a house which had been infected with the leprosy was to be cleansed, sprinkling was a prominent part of the ceremony. Lev. 14; 51. "And he shall take the cedar-wood, and the hysop, and the scarlet, and the living bird, and dip them in the blood of the slain bird, and in the running water, *and sprinkle the house seven times.*" When a man became defiled by the touch of a dead body, or any other uncleanness, he was to be cleansed by the sprinkling of the water of separation upon him. Num. 19; 13. "Whoso-

ever toucheth the dead body of any man that is dead, and purifieth not himself, defileth the tabernacle of the Lord; and that soul shall be cut off from Israel: *Because the water of separation was not sprinkled upon him, he shall be unclean.*" And in the 20th verse "But the man that shall be unclean and shall not purify himself, that soul shall be cut off from among the congregation, because he hath defiled the sanctuary of the Lord; *the water of separation hath not been sprinkled upon him; he is unclean.*"— When the Levites were to be cleansed for the peculiar service of God, a prominent part of that ceremony was the sprinkling of the water of purifying upon them. Num. 8; 6, 7. "And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying. Take the Levites from among the children of Israel, and cleanse them. And thus shalt thou do unto them to cleanse them: *Sprinkle water of purifying upon them,*" &c. And when the blood of the sacrifices which represented the blood of Christ that cleanseth from all sin, was applied to the people, it was by touching different parts of the body therewith, or it was by sprinkling it upon them. Ex. 24; 6—8. "And Moses took half of the blood, and put it in basins; and half of the blood he sprinkled on the altar. And he took

the book of the covenant, and read in the audience of the people: and they said, All that the Lord hath said will we do and be obedient.— And Moses took the blood, and *sprinkled it on the people*, and said, behold the blood of the covenant, which the Lord hath made with you concerning all these words.” See also, Lev. 8; 30 and Heb. 9; 12—22.

Thus, then, we see that sprinkling was a prominent established mode of symbolical cleansing, under the former dispensation. If an individual was to be cleansed from the Leprosy; he was to be cleansed by sprinkling. If a house which had been infected by the leprosy was to be cleansed, it was to be cleansed by sprinkling. If an individual who had become defiled by the touch of a dead body, or other uncleanness, was to be cleansed; his cleansing was to be effected by sprinkling. If the Levites were to be cleansed for the peculiar service of God, sprinkling was a prominent part of the ceremony. And if the blood of atonement, typical of the blood of Christ that cleanseth from all sin, was to be applied to the people; it was to be by sprinkling it upon them.

2d. Sprinkling, was also foretold in ancient prophecy, to be a prominent mode of symbolical

cleansing under the gospel dispensation. Is. 52; 15. "So shall he *sprinkle* many nations." Let any individual look at the previous part of this chapter, especially the 7th, and 8th verses, and he will see at a glance, that the prophet is speaking of New Testament times; "How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of him that bringeth good tidings, that publisheth peace; that bringeth good tidings of good, that pulisheth salvation; that saith unto Zion, thy God reigneth! Thy watchmen shall lift up the voice; with the voice together shall they sing; for they shall see eye to eye when the Lord shall bring again Zion." If there is a prophecy in Old Testament scripture, that refers to the gospel dispensation, it is this, and the following chapter. In the 13th verse Christ is introduced; "Behold, my servant shall deal prudently, he shall be exalted and extolled, and be very high." And it is added "As many were astonished at thee—" "So shall he *sprinkle* many nations."

This language either refers to the ordinance of baptism itself, or to the cleansing of the blood of Christ, that which baptism represents. If it refers to the ordinance of baptism, then it settles the matter at once; for it is said: "So shall he sprinkle many nations." If it refers to the ap-

plication of the cleansing blood of Christ, it ought equally to settle the matter; for it unequivocally describes the mode of application, of that, which water in baptism represents.

Ezek. 36; 25. "Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean." By looking at the following verses of this chapter, you may easily perceive that this also, is a prophecy of God's dealing with the church, under the Christian dispensation; and in reference to it, the very same remarks might be offered, that were offered on the preceding passage. It either refers to the ordinance of baptism itself, or to that which baptism symbolically represents, and in either case it affords decided proof in favour of our mode of administering the ordinance.— And surely if our opponents were for a moment to reflect upon this language of the Spirit of Inspiration, they would be a little more reserved, in their sneering ridicule, of this mode of symbolical cleansing. They may ask as often as they choose, and with as much apparent triumph as they please, how a few drops of water sprinkled on an object will cleanse it. We know that this will not be productive of any literal cleansing, (though it will cleanse just as much as dipping an object into water and lifting

it out again) but it is God's appointed symbol of spiritual cleansing. And every effort that is made to turn this mode of symbolical cleansing into ridicule, is just so much ridicule directed against the language of God himself. God says; "I will sprinkle clean water upon you," and will any one dare to ask what good will that do? what effect will a few drops of water have on an object? when God himself describes the effect, and says: "And ye shall be clean."

3d. Sprinkling, as well as pouring, also symbolizes the mode of the Spirit's descending upon men. Ps. 72; 6. "He shall come down like rain upon the mown grass; as showers that water the earth." Hosea 6; 3. "And he shall come unto us as the rain, as the latter and former rain unto the earth." The Holy Spirit is thus represented as coming like rain which wets by sprinkling. The copiousness or the scantiness of a shower, makes no difference as to the manner of its coming. It comes in such a manner as to wet by sprinkling; and this is the very thing that is done in our mode of administering this ordinance.

4th. It symbolizes, as we have already remarked, the manner in which the blood of atonement is represented as being applied to the soul.

That blood is called the *blood of sprinkling*.—They who are the people of God are elected unto obedience and *sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ*.

From what has been said then, we think it will appear evident, that the mode of administering this ordinance, by pouring or sprinkling, rests upon a firm and solid foundation. The baptism of the Holy Ghost, and the baptism of water, are frequently spoken of, in the same sentence, and in the same manner: but the Holy Ghost is poured out, or shed forth, or falls upon men. The baptism of water represents the cleansing influences of the Holy Spirit; and we find that sprinkling was one of God's prominent established modes of symbolical cleansing under the former dispensation. It was foretold to be a prominent mode of symbolical cleansing under the gospel. It symbolizes the descent of the Holy Spirit; and represents the application of that blood, which is called the blood of sprinkling.

Can any thing like this be said in favour of immersion? No! Nothing of the kind. The utmost that can be said in favour of immersion, is that in it, the same cleansing element water is used: and this being the case, we account it

so far valid as not to require to be repeated. The quantity of water however, is of no account whatever; for sprinkling, generally accounted the scantiest mode of applying the element, was one of God's own appointed modes of cleansing under the law, and was also foretold to be so under the gospel. "I will sprinkle clean water upon you and ye shall be clean." All that can be said in favour of immersion then, is, that in it the same cleansing element water is used. But it is not used in that way which is plainly pointed out by the expression, "Baptized with the Holy Ghost;" nor in that way which represents the application of the blood of sprinkling; nor in any of God's previously established modes of symbolical cleansing.

There is no way in which the scriptures will warrant us to understand the expression, "Baptized with the Holy Ghost," that is represented by immersion. In immersion the individual is applied to the water; and not the water to the individual. But there is no place in the word of God in which men are represented as being applied to the Holy Ghost; but always the Holy Ghost to them. The individual being applied to the water then instead of the water applied to the individual, he is not baptized in the sense in

which the scriptures use the word baptism, in connexion with the Holy Ghost.

There is no sense in which we can be said to be immersed in the Holy Ghost; nor any passage of scripture that gives the smallest countenance to that idea. There is only one text of scripture, so far as I am aware, that is pretended to favour the idea of being immersed in the Holy Ghost; and that is most egregiously perverted. It is Acts 2; 2. "And suddenly there came a sound from heaven, as of a rushing mighty wind, and it filled all the house where they were sitting." In reference to this we are told, that it carries in it the idea of immersion. "The Holy Ghost," say they, "fell in such a manner, and to such a degree, that the disciples were like a patient in an electric bath, as if immersed in it." But where do they get the idea that the disciples were immersed in the Holy Ghost? The Holy Ghost is not mentioned in this verse, nor till the fourth verse; and then he is said to have filled the disciples, but nowhere to have filled the house. What was it that filled all the house where they were sitting? It was the same thing that came from heaven, and that was a sound. "Suddenly there came a sound from heaven." What kind of a sound was it? It was a sound "as of a rushing

mighty wind." And what did it do? "It filled all the house where they were sitting." If there was any immersion here, then, it was an immersion in a sound; and we leave our opponents to explain that kind of immersion as they may.

The Holy Ghost comes *upon* men in his gracious influences upon the soul, but is never represented as falling *round about* men, or filling an apartment. The idea of any immersion in this case is completely exploded by the apostle's own account of the matter. "This (says he) is that which was spoken by the prophet Joel; And it shall come to pass in the last days, (saith God) I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh." And in his account of the descent of the Holy Spirit upon Cornelius and his friends. Acts 11; 15. "And as I began to speak, the Holy Ghost fell on them *as on us at the beginning.*" The Holy Ghost then had fallen *on* the disciples at the beginning. He did not fall on the outside of them, or round about them. It was the sound that surrounded them and filled all the house where they were sitting: but the Holy Spirit fell upon them, in his gracious and powerful influences upon the soul.

There is another thing to which we may here just allude. John the Baptist had foretold that

Christ would baptize with the Holy Ghost and *with fire*.* The one part of this prophecy acknowledgely met with its fulfilment on the day of Pentecost; but we think it is just as plain that the other part met with its fulfilment also. We do not say, that what happened on that day was the only fulfilment of the prophecy, that they should be baptized with fire, any more, than that what happened on that day was the only fulfilment of the prophecy, *ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost*, but it was *a* fulfilment of the prophecy in both cases. Well how were the disciples baptized with fire, on that day? was it by being immersed in it? Were they enveloped in flames? no: but the fire descended and sat upon each of them. How preposterous is it then, to maintain that *baptidzo* always has the idea of immersion in it. What idea of immersion was there in being filled with the Holy Ghost? or in having fire in the shape of cloven tongues, descending and sitting upon them?

The administration of this ordinance then, by pouring or sprinkling, is manifestly more significant of, and better calculated to represent that which is intended by it than immersion. It is more in accordance with scripture language on

*Math. 3; 11. Luke 3; 16.

the subject; "So shall he sprinkle many nations." "I will sprinkle clean water upon you and ye shall be clean." Christ's blood is called "the blood of sprinkling;" and the people of God are "elected unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ." And we are certainly at this stage of the subject warranted to conclude that it is more in accordance with scriptural example. We have in a former discourse, showed, that there is no evidence that baptism ever was administered by immersion, in any case recorded in scripture; and that there is evidence, that in some cases at least, it could not have been administered in that manner. The apostle Paul could not have been immersed, when he stood up and was baptized. Cornelius and his friends were certainly not immersed seeing the apostle inquired "Can any man forbid water?" and seeing they had just been baptized with the Holy Ghost, by having his influences fall upon them. And so we might repeat the whole of a preceding discourse, and show, not only, that there is no evidence in the New Testament of baptism having been administered by immersion, but that it is altogether improbable, that it ever was, in any recorded case, performed in that manner.

Having then, shown that pouring or sprinkling, is the most significant and scriptural mode of administering this ordinance; we proceed now,

In the Second place, *to show, that it is by far the preferable mode of administration.*

1st. *It is suited to all times places.*

This is one of the grand distinguishing characteristics of the Christian religion. The different systems of Heathenism were all local. None of them aimed at, and none of them was adapted to universality. The Jewish religion was local, and very limited in its extent. Its numerous rites and ceremonies; its oppressive tithes and burdens; the peculiar places at which God required to be worshipped, all had a tendency to restrict its influence and plainly showed that it was not intended to become universal. And the Mahometan religion, requiring of all its adherents, at least once in their lives, a pilgrimage to Mecca, as absolutely necessary to salvation; contains within itself a provision, which, if there were nothing else in the way, would forever prevent it from becoming universal over the world.

The Christian religion however, is adapted to universality; and is destined to become universal over the globe. Its universality has long been foretold in ancient prophecy; and its teach-

ers have been commanded by its divine author, to go into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. Whatever then is in its own nature calculated to restrict the influence, or retard the onward progress of Christianity, is deficient in this grand distinguishing characteristic of our holy religion. It lacks of the genius of that system, of which it professes to be a part.

Now, the exclusive claim to immersion being the only valid mode of administering this ordinance, has a tendency of this kind; for there are many parts of the world, where during a large portion of the year, it would be impossible without great expense and labour, to perform this ceremony. There are many parts of the world, so parched and dry, and streams of water are so scarce, as to render it impracticable without great labour and expense, to obtain a sufficiency of water for that purpose; at least entirely impracticable for a general practice. The very same difficulty is often presented in high northern latitudes, where streams and fountains are sealed up with frost, for so large a portion of the year together. We know that many of our Baptist brethren deny these difficulties; and some of you have heard it boldly asserted, that, wherever man has pitched his tent, there, there

may be obtained a sufficiency of water for the purpose of immersion. Well, such may be the case at some seasons of the year, and with the aid of great labour and expense. But to say that there are not many parts of the world, in which these difficulties do generally exist, and exist to such an extent, as to prevent this mode of administration from becoming applicable to the generality of the people, manifests either a very great ignorance of the world, or a determination to carry one's own point at any hazard.

Not to speak of the Arabian, and neighbouring deserts, over which tribes of Arabs are constantly wandering, there are many parts of Southern Africa where the missionaries of the cross are labouring, and where they have been labouring with success for many years, in which water is so scarce, as generally to be considered the most valuable of all commodities. In Great Namaqua-land, the only kind of idolatrous worship that is practised by the natives, is, the worship of the rain-maker. This rain-maker is none other than one of themselves, who possessing a little more shrewness than the rest, imposes upon them, making them believe that it is he who brings the rain. And while there is not the semblance of a petition presented to any superior

power, for any other blessing, they will bring their presents of sheep and cattle to the rain-maker, and offer the most earnest entreaties, that he would collect the clouds and cause the rains to descend. Moffat, who has been a missionary in that country, under the London Missionary Society, for more than twenty years; and who has written a very interesting work, describing the country, the inhabitants, missionary labour and success, &c., tells us, that there are frequently tracts of that country of hundreds of miles in extent, which appear to have the curse of Gilboa resting upon them; rain seldom falls, and the fountains are exceedingly few and precarious. Take a short extract from many that might be given illustrative of this point.*

Speaking of Great Namaqua-land, he says: "As an inhabited country, it is scarcely possible to conceive of one more destitute and miserable; and it is impossible to traverse its extensive

*Let it be remembered, that Moffat wrote with no reference to the subject now under discussion. He wrote for the purpose of enlisting the sympathies and contributions of the Christian church, in behalf of Africa—for the purpose of convincing the church, of the propriety and necessity of sustaining missionaries in that country. But there is not the most distant allusion to this controversy, in his book, from beginning to end.

plains, its rugged, undulating surface, and to descend to the beds of its *waterless rivers*, without viewing it as emphatically ‘a land of droughts,’ bearing the heavy curse of

‘Man’s first disobedience, and the fruit
Of that forbidden tree, whose mortal taste
Brought death into the world, and all our woes.’

Meeting with an individual, on my journey thither, who had spent many years in that country, I asked what was its character and appearance? ‘Sir,’ he replied, ‘you will find plenty of sand and stones, a thinly scattered population, always suffering from want of water, on plains and hills roasted like a burnt loaf under the scorching rays of a cloudless sun.’ Of the truth of this description I soon had ample demonstration. It is intersceted by the Fish and Oup rivers, with their numberless tributary streams, *if such their dry and often glowing beds may be termed*.—*Sometimes, for years together, they are not known to run*; when, after the stagnant pools are dried up, the natives congregate to their beds, and dig holes, or wells, in some instances to the depth of twenty feet, from which they draw water, generally of a very inferior quality. They place branches of trees in the excavation, and, with great labour, under a hot sun, hand up the water in a wood-

en vessel, and pour it into an artificial trough; to which the panting, lowing herds approach, *partially to satiate their thirst.*"*

In such a country, at such a time, had the Lord poured out his Spirit upon his missionary servants, giving great success to their labour, and fulfilling his promise, that a nation should be born in a day; they absolutely could not have been added to the church for want of the means of performing the initiatory rite. Our Baptist brethren themselves, though unwilling to acknowledge the difficulty, do practically admit it. To what part of the world do they send their missionaries? You will find some of them in Liberia, on the river Macklin; some in Greece; some in India, upon the rivers Mahanuddy, Cassai, and the Ganges; and principally you will find them in the Birmese and Siamese empires, countries that are full of magnificent rivers; but you will find none of them in such a country as that to which we have just referred. Where do they succeed best in our own country? Is it not in the south, where rivers are numerous, and bathing pleasant and safe? but in high northern latitudes, where immersion would be often both difficult and dangerous, they have comparative-

*Southern Africa, pages 54, 55.

ly little success. Their system contains in itself something that is not adapted to universal extension, and is therefore in so far unsuited to the genius of the gospel dispensation.

2d. *Baptism may be administered by pouring or sprinkling under any circumstances without endangering life or health.*

The most delicate constitution will not be injured by it, nor the progress of any disease accelerated by its performance: and it may be performed in cases in which immersion would be altogether impracticable.

In administering the ordinance by immersion there is often the greatest exposure both of health and life; and though our Baptist friends generally deny this, yet they practically admit it. What means all the precautions frequently taken to prevent injurious consequences following this mode of administering the ordinance, if there were no injurious consequences to be apprehended? What means the administering of warm drinks, and the bathing of the feet in *composition*, and sometimes the wrapping of the whole body in warm flannel, if there was no danger to be apprehended? Yet with all the precautions that are taken, the most serious consequences do sometimes follow.

Both health and life have been sacrificed to this practice. I speak from facts, from facts that are well known, and with some of which, I doubt not some of yourselves are acquainted. I could name a member of a respectable Pœdo-baptist church in a city not a hundred miles from this, who became dissatisfied on the subject of baptism, and could not rest until she was immersed. The consequence was, that her previously delicate constitution, received a shock from which she never recovered. I could tell of another, a number of years ago, lost in the Allegheny river, by being let slip out of the hands of the administrator, and run by the force of the current under the ice. It was but while preparing this discourse, that I received a foreign paper, giving an account of a female lost in nearly a similar manner.* Such it is true are rare

*The account is as follows:—"At Crewe, in Cheshire, there is it seems, a congregation of Mormonites or Latter-Day saints. The priest of the order is a blacksmith, of the name of Cartwright; and among the devotees is a favorite named Pugmire, also a smith or engineer. The latter was married to a respectable woman of about 30 years of age, who had born him three children, and was within three months of her next confinement. She had steadily refused to profess the fanatical opinions of her husband, and much altercation had been the consequence. Worn out, however, with his repeated solicitations, and his continued declarations that unless she submitted to be baptized into the order she would

cases, but they are cases which do occur, and which may very readily occur in similar circumstances.

be eternally lost, she declared her intention to one of her neighbours to obey her husband's wishes, being satisfied, as she said, that unless she did so, "she would never have any more peace with him." On the 23d ult., at eight o'clock at night, the poor creature was taken by her husband and the priest, to the river below the works of the Grand Junction Railway Company—was denuded of all her clothing, except a small flannel singlet—and notwithstanding her interesting situation, these wretched fanatics, after muttering some incantations, plunged her into the stream! The night was dreadfully cold and dark, and the river was running at a great rate, and was much higher than ordinary. The priest, having hold of her naked arm unfortunately let go his grasp; and the current running like a mill-race immediately carried her away; and it being pitch dark she was instantly overwhelmed by the boiling flood, and drowned! The husband walked home with the greatest deliberation and *nonchalance*, and told his neighbours what had occurred; and after seating himself in a chair, rolled himself in flannel, and declared his conviction 'that it was the will of God that she should be drowned,' adding, it was the weakness of her faith that caused it, but he was now satisfied that she was in glory! Captain Winby, of the Crewe station, and other parties, hearing of the sad occurrence, immediately rushed to the scene of the baptism, and after some time discovered the body of the unfortunate woman in a bend of the river about two hundred yards distant from the spot where she was immersed, but life was extinct. She was in a state of perfect nudity, with the exception of the slight singlet, and her clothes were found upon the bank where she had put them off previously to her calamitous immersion. A coroner's inquest was held upon the body; and the jury having returned a verdict of manslaughter, the husband and the blacksmith priest have both been committed to Chester castle to take their trial."—*Wigtonshire Free Press*; Dec. 14, 1843.

There are cases too in which an individual may be converted on a sick bed, when that sickness may to all appearance be his last, and yet though ever so desirous of receiving this ordinance, and though ever so well qualified to receive it, it could not be administered without the risk of instant death.

That these are no fancied difficulties in the way, is manifest from the fact, that a respectable body of Baptists in Germany called Mennonites, in view of these very things, have long ago abandoned the practice of immersion, though they still adhere to their former practice of baptizing only adults.*

It is true, that, if it could be clearly proved from the word of God, that immersion was the only proper and valid mode of administering the ordinance, we would be under obligations to submit to it, whatever might be the difficulties and dangers attending it. But in the absence of such proof, these difficulties form a very strong presumption against the practice. It seems contrary to the general tenor of the gospel, which is throughout a system of benevolence and mercy. "The ways of wisdom are ways of pleas-

*Miller, page 82.

antness, and all her paths are peace." "Christ's yoke is an easy yoke, and his burden a light burden." The apostles and elders of Jerusalem, in writing to the Gentile christians, in reference to the rite of circumcision, which some were bent on imposing upon them, say: "It seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us, to lay upon you no *greater burden* than these necessary things." Pointing out in an emphatical manner, the tender and merciful nature of the gospel dispensation. And the apostle Paul earnestly warns the christians against those who came in privily to spy out their liberty, and bring them again under the yoke of bondage.*

True;—Christians have often been called to endure hardships, and encounter difficulties, and suffer the loss of property, and liberty, and even life itself, for the cause of Christ; and they may be called to do so again. But this arises from the deep depravity of the human heart—from the opposition of the wicked to the cause of Christ; and not from any thing inherent in, or connected with, the religion of Christ itself. There are none of the ordinances of our holy religion, that are in their own nature, calculated to injure ei-

*Prov. 3; 17. Math. 11; 29, 30. Acts 15; 28. Gal. 2; 4. 5; 1.

ther soul or body. On the contrary, Godliness in all her internal operations, and in all her external duties, is profitable for all things; both for the life that now is, and for that which is to come. God requires mercy, not sacrifice. And to one who would urge upon delicate females to submit to immersion, at a season of the year, and under circumstances, in which it would be very doubtful, whether the most careful precautions could prevent serious consequences, we might say in the strong language of Christ himself; "Go ye, and learn what that meaneth, I will have mercy and not sacrifice."*

3d. *Baptism may be administered by pouring or sprinkling, with much more solemnity and decorum, than by immersion.* When performed in this manner, it is almost always performed in the very place where God is worshipped; whether that be in a private house, or in the public sanctuary; and in immediate connexion with the worship of God. The time, and place, and circumstances, are all calculated to impart solemnity to the ordinance, and communicate solemn impressions to the heart. The ceremony itself is so simple, as to have little tendency to attract the thoughts of either the recipient or spectator

*Math. 9; 13.

to it, but rather to direct them to that which is signified by it. And were we to ask nine out of every ten, of those who witness the ceremony performed in this manner, whether it is not rather the solemn dedication of the individual to God, than the mere external ceremony, that attracts their attention, we think they would answer in the affirmative.

On the contrary, all the circumstances connected with immersion, have a tendency to prevent that solemnity and decorum, which ought to characterize every act of religious worship. The place, the movement to the place, the crowds attracted, the curiosity excited, the anxiety to witness the external ceremony, are all unfavourable to that solemnity and decorum that ought to be connected with all the services of our holy religion. And were we to ask nine out of every ten, of those who witness the ordinance administered in this manner, we doubt not they would tell us, that it is the external ceremony, which for the time, principally engages their attention. Indeed, every thing about it, is calculated to give the whole scene the air of an interesting exhibition to man, rather than a solemn act of devotion to God.

4th. *Baptism administered by pouring or sprin-*

kling, affords a much better opportunity for the persons to be baptized being properly exercised in their own minds, than immersion. For you will observe, that though the same remark may be made in reference to parents dedicating their offspring to God, we are not now speaking of infant, but of adult baptism—not of the subjects of baptism, but of the mode of its administration. And we say that this mode, affords a far better opportunity, for those to be baptized, being properly exercised in their own minds, than immersion. The ceremony itself is so simple; as to be kept, as it were, in the back-ground; and the solemn dedication of the persons to God, the thing that is prominently presented.

What is it to be baptized into the Lord Jesus, but just to be dedicated to him—to be brought under solemn obligations to be conformed to him in all things? And by whom is this act of dedication to be performed, but by the individuals themselves? It may be signified by the administrator, in the performance of the ceremony, but the act of dedication must be performed by the individuals themselves, or the mere administration of the ceremony will be of no avail.

Now, which of these modes of administering the ordinance, is most favourable to this state of

mind? to that solemn act of dedication to God, which, however it may have been previously performed, ought to accompany the administration of this ordinance? Is it that in which the external act is kept in the back-ground, and the dedication itself the thing that is prominently presented? or is it that in which the external rite is presented with such prominence, as almost to overshadow the thing signified by it? Is it that in which persons, free from trepidation and alarm, are at liberty to direct their thoughts inward upon themselves, or upward to that God with whom they are about to enter into solemn covenant? or, is it that mode in which agitation and alarm so frequently effect the mind, especially of the female sex, as to banish almost every other thought, than that which is connected with the mere external ceremony? As God does all things well, and has adapted all the other ordinances of religion to the spiritual exercise and improvement of the soul; the considerations just stated, go far to show, that the mode which we practise, is the scriptural and divine mode, of administering this ordinance.

Lastly, we remark; (and it is a remark which might have been made at a previous part of the subject,) that, *Christ himself has plainly taught*

us, that the application of water to the whole body, is not necessary, as an emblem of spiritual cleansing. The utmost stress is constantly laid by our opponents, on having the body “wet all over;” as if it were absolutely necessary to salvation, and as if there might be some sins still unforgiven, if there were any part of the body untouched by the element of water. Indeed they would almost be willing to admit that baptism could be administered by pouring, provided only that the water was poured on in such quantities, as to wet the person all over; though we have heard those who have often witnessed the ceremony performed, question very much whether this was always the case in immersion; from the nature of the garments frequently used on the occasion. But this principle, the necessity of having the body “wet all over,” as symbolical of spiritual cleansing, is completely exploded by Christ himself. John 13; 4—10. “He riseth from supper, and laid aside his garments; and took a towel, and girded himself; after that, he poureth water into a basin, and began to wash the disciples’ feet, and to wipe them with the towel wherewith he was girded. Then cometh he to Simon Peter: and Peter saith unto him, Lord dost thou wash my feet? Jesus answered

and said unto him, What I do, thou knowest not now; but thou shalt know hereafter. Peter saith unto him, Thou shalt never wash my feet. Jesus answered him, If I wash thee not, thou hast no part with me. Simon Peter saith unto him, Lord not my feet only, but also my hands and my head. Jesus saith unto him, *He that is washed need not save to wash his feet, but is clean every whit.*"

Peter was at first unwilling that his Lord should stoop to so mean an office for him, and refused to submit, saying; "Lord thou shalt never wash my feet." When he understood, however, that it had an important symbolical meaning connected with it, for Christ had said, "If I wash thee not thou hast no part with me," he was willing not only to submit, but like our Baptist friends, he was desirous of having water used in much larger quantities, and applied to other parts of his *body*; "Lord, not my feet only, but also my hands and my head." Here again, Christ corrected him, for here again, he was in error, and replied; "He that is washed, need not save to wash his feet, but is clean every whit," that is, "he need not wash any thing save his feet, but is clean every whit." As if he had said if water is thus symbolically applied to this, or

any other part of the body it will perfectly suffice for the purpose for which it is intended. Peter would have water applied to various parts of his body, our Baptist friends go further than Peter, and will have it applied to all; but Christ's language is a refutation of the opinions of both.—For water applied to one part of the body is equally sufficient for all the purposes for which it is intended, as if it were applied to the whole.

It may be said that this was not baptism.—True, it was not literally what we call baptism; but it was the application of water to the body as emblematical of spiritual cleansing; and this is just what the ordinance of baptism is. That it was symbolical of spiritual cleansing, is manifest from the language of Christ; “He that is washed, need not save to wash his feet, but is clean every whit.” No natural cleansing of the whole body, could be effected by the washing of the feet. Hence it was not a natural, but a spiritual cleansing that was meant, and the words of Christ unequivocally assure us, that a small quantity of water applied to one part of the body, is as effectual for that purpose, as the largest that might be used. The Baptist principle of having the body “wet all over,” accords very well with the erroneous idea of Peter, but is com-

pletely refuted by the language of the Saviour.

A few remarks will conclude the whole subject.

1st. A repetition of the ordinance of baptism has always been considered a profanation of the ordinance, by almost the whole christian world. It was not commanded to be administered but once, by Christ; it was not administered but once, by the apostles; and the practice of almost the whole christian church, in all ages, has corresponded with this idea. Hence we never repeat the ordinance, in any case, in which we can at all admit, that it has been essentially performed; even though there may have been some irregularity in its performance.

Baptists themselves entertain the same ideas on this subject that we do; for they spurn the name Anabaptists, by which they were at first known, when they took their rise in Germany, during the Luthern Reformation. The word Anabaptists signifies re-baptizers, or those who baptize over again, and they received this name because they rebaptized those who had been baptized in infancy. They now discard this name however, and other denominations out of courtesy have let it drop. The reason why they discard this name, is, that they say it is not ap-

plicable to them; for those whom they baptize, they do not admit to have been baptized before. They deny the charge of being rebaptizers; and consider it a slander, under which they are not willing to lie. This fully shows that they, as well as we, consider a repetition, a profanation of the ordinance of baptism. Hence, those who, having been baptized in either manner, by a minister of any acknowledged christian church, become afterwards baptized in a different manner, are either guilty of profaning the ordinance; or they abjure their former baptism, and virtually charge all who have been baptized in the same manner, with being unbaptized persons, and unconnected with the visible church of Christ.

For a person who has been baptized one way, to be afterwards baptized in another, merely for the purpose of being able to say; that, "if there is any thing good in it, they may as well have it," or "that they will be baptized both ways, and they will be sure they are right," is nothing less than a profane sporting with sacred things.

2. Baptism is the initiatory ordinance into the visible church of Christ. It is the inducting ceremony into the company of the faithful, here on earth. As being born of the Spirit, is that

by which persons are introduced into the invisible church of Christ, and become real members of his mystical body; so being born of water, is that by which they become connected with the visible church of Christ, and recognized as included in the bonds of the covenant.

Hence, it is every individual's duty to be baptized, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. It has been commanded by Christ, and is significant of a very important effect that must be produced on the soul, before he can become an heir of salvation. And though we do not consider it, in all cases, essential to salvation; for there are many supposable cases in which an individual may become a true convert to the religion of Christ, and yet have no opportunity of being dedicated to God in this ordinance; and besides, when the ordinance is administered, it is administered on the faith, that the individual is already an heir of salvation, and not for the purpose of making him so: yet in all ordinary cases, the individual who neglects this ordinance, gives no reason to believe, that he is a subject of that which baptism represents. It is strong presumptive proof against any individual's christian character who, under ordinary circumstances, neglects this ordi-

nance. And just as obligatory as it is upon any individual to become a christian, so obligatory is it, in all ordinary cases, to obey this part of the law of Christ, and thus be publicly recognized as a follower of the Saviour.

3. We may see from this subject how we are to understand the expression; "Baptized for the remission of sins." Baptism is symbolical of the purifying influences of the Holy Spirit, and of the application of the blood of atonement which cleanses from all sin. As water is the grand element of natural cleansing, the application of it to the body, is significant of the cleansing influences of the Holy Spirit, by which the soul is cleansed from sin, and the individual truly forgiven. Where it is received in faith, it is God's appointed sign to the individual of the thing signified, viz; the cleansing of the soul from sin by the grace of the Holy Spirit. But to say that it is absolutely necessary to the forgiveness of sin, or necessary as a means of obtaining forgiveness; is contrary both to the nature of the ordinance, and contrary to the whole tenor of the gospel in reference to forgiveness.

It is contrary to the nature of the ordinance; for the ordinance is of a representative or symbolical character. It is not effectual for the

remission of sins; but symbolical of the influences of the Holy Spirit, which are effectual for that purpose. It is God's appointed sign of the thing signified. God's sign to the individual who receives it in faith, that his sins are forgiven; and not a means of procuring forgiveness.

To say that baptism is necessary as a means of obtaining remission of sins, is contrary to the whole tenor of the gospel on that subject. Remission of sins is always, in the scriptures, represented as connected with repentance and faith. "Repent, and turn from all your transgressions; so iniquity shall not be your ruin." "If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness." "Whoso confesseth and forsaketh, shall have mercy." "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved." "We are justified by faith, without the works of the Law." "Whosoever believeth in him, shall receive remission of sins."* &c. &c.

Cornelius and his friends received the gift of the Holy Ghost, even as the disciples did on the day of Pentecost, and spoke with tongues, before they received the ordinance of baptism:

*Ezek. 18; 30; I. John 1; 9. Prov. 28; 13. Acts 16; 31. Rom. 3: 28. Acts 10; 43.

and surely it will not be believed that all this could have taken place, and yet their sins be unforgiven—that they could enjoy the influences of the Holy Spirit, even as the disciples on the day of Pentecost, and yet be lying under a load of unremitting guilt.

Lastly; it is fearfully dangerous to trust to baptism or any other external ordinance, as a means of procuring the remission of sins, or of recommending you to God. Yet this is the natural tendency of the vast importance that is usually attached to immersion; and it is the grand and almost invariable tendency, of the most of the preaching that we hear on that subject. Its tendency is to exalt immersion to the place of Christ himself, and lead men to depend upon the efficacy of water, instead of the efficacy of the blood of atonement, for the forgiveness of their sins.

We speak not this unadvisedly. We have been watching the system,* in the writings and the preaching of its prominent leaders, and in the opinions of its more private members; and it is because we are fully persuaded that this is its tendency, that we have directed your atten-

*The allusion is here more particularly to Campbellism.

tion at such a length, to this subject. As we stated at the commencement, we consider the mere mode of applying the water in this ordinance, a matter of comparatively little importance; and a subject in reference to which, in itself considered, we would never have thought of occupying so much of your precious time. But when we plainly saw a tendency to lead men to trust in mere external ordinances, instead of the Lord Jesus Christ himself, to the ruin of the immortal soul; we could not, in duty to you, and in faithfulness to the commission we have received from the head of the church, suffer it to pass in silence. They who trust to the efficacy of water to wash away their sins, will find themselves just as much disappointed at last, as they who trust to the idol gods of heathenism. "Other foundation can no man lay, than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ;" and those who trust to any thing else than the merits of Jesus for salvation, are building on a sandy foundation; a foundation which will one day be swept from under them, and leave them to tumble into the gulf of perdition.

Thus then under a sense of our duty to you, and our obligations to that God who has set us as a watchman upon this part of the walls of Zion,

we have directed your attention to this subject, and warned you of its dangerous tendency.— And though there may be some who will not take the warning, and though we know nothing of what may be the future course of any who have heard these discourses, we think we can say that on this subject at least, we have delivered our soul.

DATE DUE

~~11/11/69~~



Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 01021 3843